

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 533

SP 017 153

AUTHOR Dumais, Mary Dean: And Others
TITLE Point-Counterpoint Between Federal Policy and Inservice Education Programs in Teacher Corps.
INSTITUTION Center for New Schools, Inc., Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE Sep 80
CONTRACT 300-78-0515
NOTE 84p.
AVAILABLE FROM Distributor, Center for New Schools, 59 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900, Chicago, IL 60605 (No price given).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis; *Federal Regulation; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Administration; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Self Evaluation (Groups); Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Effectiveness; Trend Analysis

IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

Federal policies and local practices pertaining to inservice teacher education were analyzed from four perspectives. A content analysis was made of current inservice literature. The relationship between assumptions about effective inservice education in the literature and in federal government statements was analyzed. A team of researchers compared six Teacher Corps programs in their contexts and demonstrated how uniqueness emerges among programs based on the same federal rules and regulations. An analysis was made of the content of anecdotes written by central staff in Teacher Corps programs to ascertain the importance of certain factors in the transition from policy statements to inservice practice. The relationship between Teacher Corps policy statements and resulting inservice programs was examined. The findings suggest that: (1) There are specific assumptions about effective inservice teacher education, some of which are reflected both in the literature and in federal policy statements; (2) Federal programs based on the same rules and regulations are similar in terms of certain basic processes and different in terms of context-related variables such as content, strategies, and unanticipated critical events; and (3) There is a need for more systematic forecasting related to inservice teacher education because there are discrepancies among literature, federal policies, and local practice. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED195533

SP 017 153

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DEMONSTRATION CLUSTER PROJECTS

Hofstra/Westbury Teacher Corps
Doris Fromberg, Director
School of Education
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York 11550

Houston Teacher Corps
H. Jerome Freiberg, Director
University of Houston
College of Education
445 Farish Hall
4800 Calhoun
Houston, Texas 77004

Idaho State/Pocatello Teacher Corps
John E. Mook, Director
College of Education
Box 8059
Idaho State University
Pocatello, Idaho 83209

Pittsburgh Teacher Corps
Erma Williams, Director
Pittsburgh Public Schools
341 S. Bellefield Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Kean/Passaic Teacher Corps
Mary Dean Dumais, Director
Kean College of New Jersey
Willis 101, Morris Avenue
Union, New Jersey 07083

West Florida/Okaloosa Teacher Corps
Marcy Szymanski, Director
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida 32503

Cover design by BW/LF Fredette

The material reported herein was prepared pursuant to USOE Contract Number 300-78-0515. Contractors undertaking projects under such government sponsorship are encouraged to freely express professional judgment in the conduct of such projects. Points of view or opinion stated herein, therefore, do not represent official position or policy of the Department of Education.

POINT-COUNTERPOINT BETWEEN FEDERAL POLICY
AND INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN TEACHER CORPS

THE DEMONSTRATION CLUSTER:

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SCHOOLS

Mary Dean Dumais, Kean College of New Jersey
Gordon Eade, University of West Florida
Doris Fromberg, Hofstra University
Charles J. Gorman, University of Pittsburgh
John E. Mook, Idaho State University
Marcy Szymanski, University of West Florida
Karan Townsend, University of Houston
Jean Winsand, University of Pittsburgh

September, 1980

Center for New Schools
59 East Van Buren-Suite 1900
Chicago, Illinois 60605

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
CHAPTER ONE: SIBLINGS UNDER THE SKIN: THE INSERVICE EDUCATION FOCUS OF EACH PROGRAM IN THE EXPERIMENTAL CLUSTER . .	1
CHAPTER TWO: AN ASSUMPTIVE FRAMEWORK FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION . . .	5
A. The Content Dimension of the Assumptive Framework	5
B. The Process Dimension of the Assumptive Framework	10
C. The Context Dimension of the Assumptive Framework	16
CHAPTER THREE: AN ANALYSIS OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES RELATED TO INSERVICE EDUCATION	24
Procedure 1. Identify an assumptive framework for inservice education from the technical literature on this topic	24
Procedure 2. Select specific Federal Rules and Regulations pertaining to inservice education from the collection of program rules and regulations governing Teacher Corps	25
Procedure 3. Formulate observations regarding the probable linkage of Federal Rules and Regulations with the technical literature on inservice education .	33
Procedure 4. Analyze selected Teacher Corps Federal Rules and Regulations on inservice education from a "critical mass" perspective	37
Procedure 5. Relate practices of six Teacher Corps projects to both the Federal Rules and Regulations and the technical literature.	40
Procedure 6. Synthesize findings regarding the features of Federal Rules and Regulations, assumptive frame- work and operational practices for inservice education	59
CHAPTER FOUR: RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING POLICY FOR INSERVICE PROGRAMS IN TEACHER CORPS	62
REFERENCES:	66

PREFACE

In 1978, the Center for New Schools, a non-profit organization committed to fostering educational improvement through research, policy analysis, and technical assistance, entered into a contract with the U.S. Office of Education to support the Teacher Corps program in its efforts to extend the program's impact beyond the jurisdiction of current projects, under the title "Analysis and Support of Teacher Corps Demonstration Objectives." The contract included review of literature, assistance to local projects in fulfilling the mandate in the 1978 program regulations that each project contain objectives and activities aimed at promoting "Adoption or adaptation of (educational improvements developed in the projects) by other educational institutions and agencies," and a variety of investigations and experiments aimed at testing collective forms of synthesizing and sharing the results of projects.

In this last group of activities, one of the strategies of the contractor was to develop a series of "demonstration cluster," groups of projects which would form to discuss a common thematic issue and develop a joint product which reflected the concerns, knowledge and skills of each participant and of the program as a whole. During the first year of the contract, the Center developed and received reactions from federal staff and local project personnel on the design of this experiment and the themes around which the projects would be grouped. Ultimately, the format that was chosen reflected the following premises:

- Participation would be voluntary on the part of local projects, with selection based on proposals submitted in response to a formal Call.
- Groups would be small, with an optimum size of 5-6 project participants.
- Clusters would be seen as temporary, product-oriented efforts. (This concern, interestingly enough, came from local projects themselves.)
- On the other hand, clusters would be basically self-governing, with a small budget to utilize as they saw fit.

The Cluster Call was issued in September 1979, to all existing Teacher Corps projects. In the interim, the Center was notified that, due to program budget cutbacks, the contract would only be continued through September, 1980. The original plan suggested a 14-16 month life span for the clusters. Because of the new limitation, the performance period was cut to eight and one-half months.

In early January, Center staff met in Atlanta with representatives of twenty-four participating projects, grouped by their theme selection into five groups ranging in size from three to six projects. After a morning spent in general briefing and questions and answers, the rest of this one and one-half day meeting was spent in working sessions in which each cluster group was asked

to generate a project work-plan and budget. (The average budget per cluster group was \$4200.) Since then, the clusters have been carrying out their plans in individualized and exciting ways. Each has taken its own course, developed its own style of operation and formats for product development, faced many problems and resolved them. With one exception, each group is moving toward a completion of project responsibilities with the development of a final product.

This report was prepared by one of two clusters which initially addressed the theme "IHE in the Schools: Models for the Relationship." However, true to the spirit of the cluster experiment, the participants realized early in their deliberations that their concerns for general policy issues related to inservice training were broader than that defined by the theme. The result is a product which brings into sharp focus the process of "triangulation" between Federal policy as evidenced in the Teacher Corps Law and Regulations, the literature on effective inservice, and the day-to-day life of projects. The conclusions of the report may be debatable. In fact, the very nature of the product promotes constructive debate; but the task itself, and the methods devised to carry it out, are, we think, exceptional advances in the arena of policy analysis. We commend this product to the attention of all those who are engaged in policy discussions related to professional development.

The staff of the Center want to acknowledge the support of certain individuals who made important contributions to the evolution of the Cluster concept and its implementation. In particular, we should mention our Project Officer, Beryl Nelson, who not only originated the cluster concept in the RFP but also participated in many phases of development and implementation. Various advisors, consultants, and former staff made excellent contributions, especially Richard Arends, James Becker, Paul V. Collins, G. Thomas Fox, Manford Holmes, Bess Howard, Lee Morris, Joyce Putnam, Clayton Small, and Thomas Wilson. But finally, the main thanks must go to the members of each cluster for their willingness to risk their time and energy with only intrinsic compensation and for their diligence in carrying out tasks in this experimental environment. We commend them, and their products, to your attention.

Stephen T. Andrews
Center for New Schools
September, 1980

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In November 1979, the Teacher Corps Demonstration Consortium Contractor, the Center for New Schools, requested the FY 78 and FY 79 Teacher Corps projects to submit proposals targeted for an experimental effort in cross-project interaction. Four voluntary clusters of approximately six projects would collaborate from January 1980 through September 1980 to:

"...synthesize their ideas, methods, and funding in a particular thematic area related to their work in Teacher Corps. The goal of this effort will be the development of a cluster product to be shared with other Teacher Corps projects and with relevant groups outside Teacher Corps in keeping with the Fourth Outcome of the Teacher Corps regulations. The promoting of the adoption/adaptation of what has been learned in Teacher Corps... Both the Consortium and Teacher Corps Washington considers this to be a significant experiment in cross-project cooperation which will serve local project needs as well as program goals."

(Letter to Project Directors from
William L. Smith, Director,
Teacher Corps, November 1, 1979)

On January 9, 1980, members of the Demonstration Cluster: The IHE in the Schools met for the first time in Atlanta to refine content of the product, identify the key audiences for the product, reach agreement on the form and cost of the product, and establish both organizational structure and assignment of tasks necessary to produce the product. At the completion of the work sessions in Atlanta, all six project representatives agreed to disseminate assigned information across Cluster participants by mail in advance of the second meeting scheduled for February, prior to the AACTE National Conference.

In Dallas, the work session of February 25 gave the group an opportunity to clarify and revise tasks. More specific assignments were delineated and the participants returned to their individual projects with a greatly refined perspective on the proposed monograph.

Writing and cross-checking by telephone among cluster members continued until the April 10-11 meeting in Pittsburgh, where much of the present document was hammered out and the final product began to take shape. Jean Winsand is to be commended for the excellent arrangements for this work session.

In Philadelphia on May 27, the Cluster's last meeting took place but fiscal and program exigencies of each Teacher Corps project weighed heavily on cluster participants and completion of the monograph had to be postponed until late summer/early fall.

The final document gives evidence of considerable effort on the part of the participants in reading, analyzing, checking feedback, and reporting. In

acknowledging contributions to the monograph, commendations are due the six Teacher Corps projects who supported the effort by releasing key personnel for off-site work sessions. Special thanks are also extended to Carol Fiumara and Mary Ignatz of the University of Pittsburgh, School of Education for typing the manuscript.

Special recognition should also be given to Karan Townsend for her detailed search of the literature, to Charles Gorman for his monumental organizational contribution which has resulted in a coherent document and to Mary Dean Dumais for her management of the resources allocated to the cluster.

Mary Dean Dumais
Reporting for --
The Demonstration Cluster: IHE in the Schools
September, 1980

CHAPTER ONE

SIBLINGS UNDER THE SKIN: THE INSERVICE EDUCATION FOCUS OF EACH PROGRAM IN THE EXPERIMENTAL CLUSTER

This examination of inservice education policies and practices in Teacher Corps represents an analysis of documents about the topic. Three informational sources have been utilized including Federal Rules and Regulations which govern Teacher Corps Projects, technical literature on inservice education and a variety of descriptions about six active projects. The central purpose of the analysis was to improve inservice education by honing the issues associated with the content, process and structure of a professional development program. The report was produced by persons who hold a variety of roles with six projects--director, program specialist, documentor/evaluator and university coordinator.

Inservice education emerged as the overriding issue around which there existed the most diversity, ambiguity and confusion by the participants of this Demonstration Cluster. As a result, the authors felt that an attempt to seek out some of the underlying causes for these variables would be a worthwhile educational endeavor. Thus, the present document was conceived.

The projects represented in this cooperative effort are tied to school districts that are urban--Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Passaic, New Jersey; Houston, Texas; suburban--Westbury, New York; and rural--Okaloosa, Florida; Snake River, Idaho. All of the universities are public institutions from Program '78--University of Pittsburgh; Kean College of New Jersey; University of Houston; University of West Florida; and Idaho State University--except for Hofstra University which is a private, independent institution from Program '79. Program '78 projects are completing Year 2 of the five-year cycle and the Program '79 project is completing Year 1. Staffing patterns appear on Table 1 on the next page.

TABLE 1

STAFFING PATTERNS IN SIX TEACHER CORPS PROJECTS, 1979-1980

STAFF FUNCTIONS

PROJECTS

	Houston '78	Hofstra '79 Year 1 Year 2		West Florida '78	Pittsburgh '78	Idaho State '78	Kean College '78
Director	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Inservice Coordinator	50%	50%	100%	50%	62%	100%	50%
LEA Coordinator	50%	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Documentor	50%			100%	58%	35%	50%
Evaluator	50%	50%	50%			0	
Special Education Coordinator	0			0	0	0	0
Community Coordinator	100%	50%	100%	50%	0	50%	100%
Team Leader	100%	25%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Multicultural Coordinator	0	25%	25%	50%	0	0	0
Miscellaneous Instructional Staff	0	0	0	25%	28%	40%	40%
Total Personnel	4.5	3	4.75	4.75	7	3.75	5.33

A brief synopsis of the unique approach to inservice education that exists in each project appears below. All but one project specify an integrated system for building the capacity of personnel to disseminate inservice education program elements, and the one project operates a system for internal dissemination. All projects specify a collaborative governance system for developing the inservice education program.

Hofstra University

Interdisciplinary Substance. An interdisciplinary university staff (Hofstra Interdisciplinary Team) develops inservice education activities through collaborative governance with an emergent cadre of Dissemination Teams from various role groups. Interdisciplinary substantive Content and Continuity through Cooperative modes of teaching and study is the major focus of this project's inservice education program.

University of Houston

Teachers Train Teachers. Graduate courses developed through a collaborative planning procedure are offered as a forum in which inservice personnel can identify educational needs and develop individual and/or group projects to alleviate those needs. In addition, project staff members assist teachers in developing short workshops in which teachers train teachers.

Idaho State University

Classroom Followup. Needs assessment and collaborative planning are used as the bases for developing inservice education programs. Group course work and study is the catapult for planning, developing, and implementing course-related activities as school projects. The project develops inservice activities in which teachers can feel comfortable and gain skills for sharing with their colleagues.

Kean College of New Jersey

Demonstration Teams. A multiple-role group design team - across local district, community, School of Education - creates the inservice teacher education program. Demonstration teams are built across target schools. Task force groups are developed across college departments. Systems for inservice and field-based instruction are designed and disseminated.

University of Pittsburgh

Independent Study Contracts. Teachers develop individually designed professional study contracts in conjunction with the Evaluation and Monitoring System which is being installed as the demonstrable element of the project. These contracts are specified according to a structure which has been designed to reflect the academic requirements of graduate-level work at the University of Pittsburgh. Faculty advisors assist in drawing up the contracts in either curriculum development, instructional technique, materials development, or management techniques. The general focus of all contracts is on Mathematics, Science and Academic Learning Time. Group meetings for planning and sharing findings are scheduled.

The University of West Florida

Interaction Partner System. Inservice activities are decentralized through voluntary pairs of degree and non-degree teachers engaged in varied on-site interaction research projects specifically addressing a school concern. Incentives for the non-degree participant include flexible scheduling and inservice credit points. Degree participants partially fulfill course requirements and are motivated by colleague assistance and the use of limited allotted funds for carrying out proposed activities. A long term incentive for both partners is demonstration/training opportunity.

CHAPTER TWO

AN ASSUMPTIVE FRAMEWORK FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION

There are plenty of the essential ingredients for success (in inservice education); yet, somehow these are not being brought together effectively, and nearly everyone is dissatisfied (Joyce, McNair, Diaz, and McKibbin, 1977, p.60).

What are the essential ingredients for effective inservice education?

Three critical areas are identified in this analysis of inservice education literature and three assumptions about effective inservice education have been formulated from these critical areas. This technical information has been selected to represent an assumptive framework pertaining to the content, processes and context of inservice education.

A. The Content Dimension of the Assumptive Framework

Assumption One:

The content of effective inservice is determined by techniques that are consistent with fundamental principles of effective teaching and learning (such as needs assessment, field-based instruction, demonstrations, active learning experiences, practice of skills, and feedback).

Needs-based content is defined as content or substance addressed during an inservice program which is presented in response to professional/instructional needs stated by the teacher and/or needs of the teacher which are identified by others. This definition allows for the teachers who have varying levels of experience. Inservice consultants should take into account teachers' varying levels of experience and subsequent needs, and they should help teachers expand their experiences (Freiberg, 1977a, p.59). Teachers with broadened experiences recognize needs which are theirs by virtue of the fact that teachers function within a community and an institution which has its own needs.

The task of inservice educators is to work with teachers to articulate and operationalize those needs since teachers are usually not motivated to master and apply inservice objectives which are based on content they perceive as irrelevant to their needs (Long, 1977, pp. 78-90). Joyce, Howey, and Yarger (1977) agree that inservice teacher education should "be organized in such a way that individual teachers can perceive its importance in their lives" and that portions should be determined according to personal feelings, diagnosis of the teacher's needs by others, and systems needs or thrusts (p. 12). The comprehensive Montgomery County, Maryland Inservice Education Program suggests that a school district can, acting as a corporate entity, develop an effective inservice program which meets both the needs of the teachers and the system (Nelson, 1977, pp. 71-80).

The related notions of needs-based content and needs assessment (diagnosis) have received extensive attention in the literature. The underlying themes in most of the discussions are that: (a) the design of inservice education must allow for individual differences in terms of affective and cognitive readiness as well as learning styles (Lippitt and Fox; and Westby-Gibson, 1976); (b) the values and goals implicit in the inservice design must be congruent with those of the participants or the new ideas are likely to be either symbolically implemented or not implemented at all (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975, pp. 17-18); and (c) teachers ought to be the ones who take the initiative to improve their competence with the help of an impartial outsider who enables them to make a diagnosis, analysis, and prescription regarding the situation (Bush, 1971, p. 57; and Shingleton, 1977, pp. 60-67).

Rubin (1971) summarizes the significance of the preceding themes in his discussion of the danger of imposing on teachers the notions of others as to what is good for teachers in inservice programs and in their classrooms.

Rubin concludes:

The teacher is not a helpless learner, and his own perception of what will enable him to function more effectively may serve as our most intelligent point of departure. Apart from its psychological validity, such an approach will circumvent the individual's resistance to external direction, and it will make him an active rather than a passive participant in the shaping of his own growth (pp.35-36).

In conjunction with needs-based content, a second major technique that appears to be associated with effective inservice education is field-based instruction. Field-based instruction is defined as instruction which requires that inservice educators work directly with teachers in their classrooms to facilitate the teacher's mastery and application of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. The rationale for field-based instruction lies in the assumption that it relates professional growth to life in the classroom. Inservice activities can be brought to bear directly upon the problems teachers encounter in their everyday work. Field-based instruction is not evident in numerous current inservice programs which emphasize continuing acquisition of concepts and skills in anticipation of future use, much in the pattern of preservice training and unfortunately resulting in minimal transfer of learning to daily classroom life (Lippitt and Fox, p.139; Long, 1977, pp. 78-90). However, those programs in which field-based instruction is evident, such as the inservice program discussed by George and Stearn (1977, pp.67-73) and certain university and/or district-based clinical supervisory models (Mesa, 1977, p.70; Nelson, 1977, pp.68-77; and Sergiovanni, 1975) do report success in affecting teacher behavior.

Field-based instruction possesses both physical and psychological advantages. Allen (1971) puts forth a cogent argument for field-based instruction:

If in-service training is to have any direct effect upon the education of students, then it must become much more closely tied to particular schools, and much less reliant upon nearby schools of education and their lecture halls. A meaningful in-service program is one in which training is directed toward teacher performance goals, of immediate relevance to teachers' everyday professional experience (p.113).

There is a hidden agenda in the field-based instruction issue. If inservice activities are to be focused upon the classroom of the teacher, then means must be structured into the schedule and work load of the teacher so that the inservice staff can work with teachers as they interact with students during school hours. There are a number of issues related to the notion of inservice education during school, and these issues have received a great deal of discussion in the literature. According to George and Stearn (1977), field-based instruction combined with released time (released time implying that someone else has assumed the teachers' regular classroom responsibilities) permits the teacher to move easily from the inservice setting in which new knowledge, skills, and attitudes are developed to the classroom setting where these new abilities can be applied and adapted immediately (pp.67-73).

The overall concept of field-based instruction receives support from Lawrence (1974) who concludes after a review of 90 studies on inservice education:

Inservice programs in schools and on college campuses are equally capable of effecting teacher behavior, but the school settings tend to be capable of influencing more complex behavior changes... Teacher attitudes are more likely to be influenced in school-based than in college-based inservice programs (p.8).

The literature suggests that the concept of field-based instruction in and of itself is not a sufficient means of assuring effective inservice education. Learning activities for teachers should be designed to reflect demonstrations, active learning, practice, and feedback. The characteristics of learning activities designed for inservice sessions strongly influence whether or not teachers are able to meet objectives established for the inservice sessions. The learning activities should link conceptual learning with behavioral implications for the individual. Learning designs should activate and link the cognitive, affective, and action aspects of the self (Lippitt and Fox, 1971, p.139). Inservice educators must provide the teacher with the time and tools necessary to concept-

ualize one's experience, and to reach insights that alter perceptions of both role and task (Rubin, 1971, p.36). Empirical evidence in support of the preceding contentions is offered by Berman and McLaughlin (1975) who state:

We saw that the effectiveness of training was conditioned by the training format and by who did the training. Teachers strongly preferred very concrete "how-to-do-it" workshops given by local personnel (as opposed to a more general lecture, inspirational format) (pp.17-19).

Lawrence's review of inservice education studies provides support for these basic concepts:

Inservice programs that have differentiated training experiences for different teachers (that is, 'individualized') are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that have common activities for all participants... Inservice education programs in which teachers share and provide mutual assistance to each other are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs in which each teacher does separate work.

According to Bush (1971), feedback is another important factor in effective learning. Bush explains that in most studies to date, the combination of the use of demonstrations, feedback, and supervisory discussion tends to be a more powerful technique than any one of them alone (p.59). The clinical supervision model, which incorporates the preceding combination of elements, is believed by many to be an effective means of modifying teacher behavior (Fischler, 1971; and Goldhammer, 1969). Westby-Gibson (1967) and Mesa (1977, p.90) also identify a "clinical professor" model incorporating feedback as being effective in modifying teacher behavior.

The general concepts of demonstrations, active learning, practice, and feedback as previously defined and developed are supported by Bloom (1976, p.202). The basic ideas discussed by Bloom (the learner's history and characteristics and the quality of instruction) parallel those which were the focus of this discussion. However important these concepts are, they alone will not assure

the effectiveness of inservice programs.

The concept of feedback has a much broader application than its utilization as an effective technique of teaching and learning. The concept of feedback is the basis of a systemic program model and is reflected in the second major assumption about effective inservice education.

B. The Process Dimension of the Assumptive Framework

Assumption Two:

The processes of effective inservice education programs manifest systemic and parity-based collaborative arrangements.

A systemic model of program design, development, implementation, and evaluation is one in which planning, monitoring, and revising are flexible and adaptive. The model establishes and maintains open channels of communication; sets forth initial goals and objectives with a collaborative body of participants; and provides the means for reassessing goals and activities, monitoring project achievements and problems, and modifying practices in light of institutional program demands (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975, p.19).

According to Unruh (1975), concepts of feedback and information processing have been brought to the attention of many disciplines and have made available new ways of thinking about complex problems and their changing relationships.

Unruh notes:

A systems approach is action-oriented. It responds to needs in a logical, orderly manner. It requires that something be done and, when done, that it be evaluated. A systems approach is an analytic rather than an erratic approach. It requires planning and action to be accomplished in a manner that allows participants to revise the plans, as action and experience proceed, and incorporate constructive improvements (pp.248-249).

In her discussion, Unruh emphasizes the value of the systemic model in terms of its superiority over erratic linear or single-principle approaches which have been inadequate in the past. She delineates the main elements of a systems

approach (broad goals, needs, objectives, constraints, alternatives, selection, implementation, evaluation, and modification) and points out how this approach functions to provide a responsive program which is effective in achieving its objectives (pp.247-274). Nystrand and Cunningham (1970) and Gilchrist and Gott (1971) contend that a systems model has the potential for helping education through better decision-making. To quote Gilchrist and Gott:

(A) systems approach wisely applied will enable educators, citizens, and students to become partners in developing an educational program that is the best current knowledge, research, and resources can provide. Not only so, but a systems approach will enable educators to see the interdependence of their individual roles in the total educational program (p.28).

Prentice (1973) notes the value of the holistic qualities of a systems approach as it relates to management strategies. In her words:

Thus all parts of a system are seen as being interdependent, and the system itself is greater than the sum of its parts. When fully considering these qualities, one does not 'band-aid' one part of the system without careful analysis of the consequences to other parts of the system; neither does one make decisions while in a crisis-mode without assessing potential alternatives (p.310).

The rationale for a systemic model is that it inherently provides for flexible approaches with feedback and self-correction built into the program (Fischer, pp.236-237). Banathy (1968) explains that systemic evaluation and quality control ensure that the objectives of the system are being met or that adjustments will be introduced in order to correct the system if objectives are not being met. The strategies utilized include system monitoring (evaluation and analysis), performance testing in relation to program objectives, and system adjustments (pp.79-82). Banathy concludes, "The self-adjusting characteristics of systems prescribe change as a perpetual process in the development, operation, and maintenance, of systems" (p.82).

The systemic model of program design, development, implementation, and evaluation may also be considered in relation to Scriven's (1974) discussion of formative evaluation. In establishing the significance of formative evaluation, Popham (1977) states, "Rarely has a conceptual clarification been so quickly and so widely adopted by a specialization" (p.14). Formative evaluation refers to assessments of worth focused on programs that are capable of being modified and therefore implies continuous monitoring and revision of all aspects of a program. Popham (1975) explains:

The heart of the formative evaluator's strategy is to gather empirical evidence regarding the efficacy of various components of the instructional sequence and then consider this evidence in order to isolate deficits and suggest modifications (p.14).

Scriven (1972) likens the process to that of field-testing which he perceives as a process of getting feedback on the basis of which one produces programmatic revisions (p.30). In agreement with Bishop (1977, p.52), Bloom, Hastings, Thomas, and Madaus (1971) consider the process of formative evaluation a critical programmatic process and conclude, "The hope is that the users of the formative evaluation will find ways of relating the results of the evaluation to the learning and instructional goals they regard as important and worthwhile" (pp.117-118).

The value of the systemic approach to program design, development, implementation, and evaluation is reflected in the usefulness of the Tyler Rationale in the area of curriculum (Tyler, 1949). The Tyler Rationale unites basic curriculum processes (statement of purposes, selection and organization of learning experiences, and evaluation) into a systemic model. This model for many years has guided the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of curricula.

Collaboration refers to a voluntary association which may include school organizations, professional organizations, colleges or universities, government

agencies and citizens who work together in a joint venture to achieve some separately held and some commonly held goals or objectives; it involves sharing of planning, decision-making, and human and material resources in the venture; each organization maintains its own organizational independence and identity throughout (Drummond, 1976, p.29).

Collaboration is believed by many to be important during all phases of program design, development, and implementation and evaluation (Allen, 1975, p.69; Jeffers and McDaniels, 1975, pp.24-31; and Smith, 1975). These educators and others such as the vast majority of the 1,016 persons interviewed during the Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project (Joyce, McNair, Diaz, McKibbin, 1977, pp.58-60) feel that if collaboration is achieved, a program is more likely to be relevant to the needs of the participants. Mesa (1977) reports that collaboration with parity among participating groups achieved programmatic relevance and vigor in major programs with which he was associated. There appears to be a strong relationship between parity-based collaboration and desirable program outcomes (e.g., establishing and achieving desired objectives, feelings of control and cohesiveness, and broadening knowledge and attitudes toward others). Various programs have proven that parity-based collaboration is a viable concept (pp.52-70).

The rationale for collaboration in inservice education is two-fold: educational and political (Nicholson and Joyce, 1977, pp.33-34; and West, 1977, pp.38-44). The educational aspect is best explained as an assumption that the involvement of other entities which are intimately concerned with teacher education would be likely to enhance the quality of inservice education and teacher education in general (Lawrence, 1974; Mesa, 1978, p.70; Thelen, 1971; Tyler, 1971; and Westby-Gibson, 1967). The political aspect is explained in terms of several pressures to operate collaboratively. Nicholson and Joyce (1977, pp.33-35) list several sources of pressure, including: (a) the recent English concern with the revolution

in inservice education and in schooling as exemplified in the Plowden Report (1972) and the James Report (1972); (b) increased teacher militancy as exemplified in action of the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association; (c) the general disenchantment and disillusionment of the public with the educational establishment as exemplified in recent legislation such as that in New York state which requires that higher education institutions affiliate with school districts, teachers' organizations, and communities in the creation of collaborative inservice teacher education arrangements; and (d) federal legislation such as that regulating Teacher Corps which requires that school districts, higher education institutions, and community members collaborate to present proposals for inservice education and to build organizations to carry them out.

Rosner discusses the significance of the movement toward preservice/in-service competency-based education and certification in terms of its facilitation of collaborative arrangements (Rosner, Cohen, DeVault, Schalock, Stewart, Turner, and Tittle, 1972, Ch. 5). Although interpreted differently in different situations, collaboration is usually considered as an associated component of competency based education.

The teacher center concept likewise facilitates collaborative arrangements in inservice education. Howey (1977) discusses the Minneapolis Schools/University of Minnesota Teacher Center as an experiment in organizational governance based on collaborative approaches to program and staff development. This relatively flat hierarchial management pattern stressing the concept of parity resulted in a pattern of mutual benefits for all the systems participating in the collaborative arrangement (pp.70-95).

The findings of Lawrence (1974) corroborate the preceding conclusion that parity-based collaboration results in mutual benefits for the participants.

Lawrence states that school-based programs in which teachers, supervisors, and administrators participate as helpers to each other and planners of inservice activities tend to have greater success in accomplishing their objectives than to do programs which are conducted by outside personnel without their assistance (pp.11-15). One might therefore assume that programs are potentially more effective if participants are able to develop a parity-based model of collaboration.

However, the simplicity of the collaborative parity-based concept of governance in inservice education belies the difficulty of operationalizing the concept. The literature abounds with conflicting discussions of parity in terms of which entities should be involved in collaborative arrangements and what the roles of the various entities should be. For example, there is disagreement as to when expertise rather than parity should predominate in decision-making (Rosner, 1972).

The interviews with 1,016 educators reported by Joyce, McNair, Diaz, and McKibbin (1977, p.19-20) provide evidence as to the disparate conceptions as to who should assume responsibility for the organization, content and process of inservice education programs. The responses of those interviewed indicate that persons in various positions have discrepant views about critical inservice issues.

Parity is the opposite of authoritarian decision-making and conflict and controversy are to be expected. Nicholson and Joyce (1977) summarize the implications of this mode of decision-making:

The objective of achieving parity in this conflict-oriented sense is not so much to improve teacher education by increasing the information input as to assure the fairness and credibility of school decisions on the basis of guaranteed participation by the various entities.... Assuming the existence of a proper, agreed-upon dispute-

resolving mechanism and the input into that mechanism of the stances of the various entities, each entity will have had its "day in court" and will be obliged to stand by the outcome (p.47).

As evidenced by the discrepancies in opinion among those of various positions who were interviewed regarding organizational, process, and content responsibilities, the concept of parity-based collaboration is likely to be difficult to achieve (Joyce, McNair, Diaz, and McKibbin, 1977). However, the potential benefits of collaboration make it worth the effort to resolve conflict and controversy in terms of long-term program effectiveness (Drummond, 1976, p.31).

A systemic model of program design, development, implementation, and evaluation which is based upon a concept of parity-based collaboration requires that careful attention be given to organizational context and support systems.

C. The Context Dimension of the Assumptive Framework

Assumption Three

Effective inservice teacher education takes into account the structure of the organizational context and support systems in which they function.

Programs are inevitably influenced by the context in which they are designed, developed, implemented, and evaluated. Context refers to the myriad of interdependent situational, psychological, and sociological variables within which a program exists that have the potential to influence the effectiveness of the program.

Edelfelt (1977) explains that establishing organizational context means:

...recognizing and identifying the givens in a particular region, state, or local situation, making clear the context in which we work. It means spelling out what schools and teachers are all about, with a lot of help from parents and students. The context also includes other community forces, other agencies--certainly business, industry, and churches, but also the police, the courts, recreation, and other groups. There is, in addition, a psychological and philosophical context, the sense of how people feel about themselves and each

other, where people are along a reactionary-conservative-liberal-radical continuum, to what degree they are able to live with such differences, and how they regard each other as a result of these differences. It may also be important to look at how the world outside influences the local context.

(Taking into account the organizational context) means clarifying a concept of staff development: where staff development fits into the general scheme of school and whether it is an integral and essential part of the activity of the school (pp.115-116).

Contextual variables have been categorized into three major groups by Tikumoff and Ward (1977, p.4). According to these researchers, situational variables include the goals of the participants, the setting, the activities which involve participants, the nature of the roles of the participants and the time dimensions surrounding the event. Experiential variables refer to the participants or observers of an event and the particular meaning they bring to an event. Communicational variables are defined as the levels of transformation of information involved in the event, both intentionally and unintentionally, at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and group levels. The importance of organizational context is demonstrated by Manning (1976) who has developed an instrument measuring seven contextual variables which are predictive of an institution's potential for successfully adopting innovations. Berman and McLaughlin (1975) state that variables concerned with contextual characteristics are associated more often with project outcomes than any other factor (p.20).

Westby-Gibson (1967) conducted a review of psychological and sociological research applicable to inservice education and a survey of innovations in the area. She concludes that effective inservice programs depend upon nuances in the social setting, the structure of the school, interactions between teacher-school-inservice educator, and other organizational context variables. Specifically, Westby-Gibson states:

Inservice education programs should be reorganized in such a way that conformity to group norms will result in behavior changes.... Designated administrative roles should include a responsibility for educational leadership in inservice education.... Communication channels should be explicitly defined.... Informal as well as formal communications networks in the schools should be used to disseminate new ideas among faculties.

Gant, South, and Hansen (1977) have directed their attention to organizational context in a discussion of the practical aspect of managing temporary systems. A temporary system is a self-contained group of individuals who have their own reasons for being, location, membership, time limits, rules and roles for operation.

From their experience with temporary systems such as Teacher Corps and other educational programs, Gant and his colleagues (1977) conclude that in order to operate an effective temporary system (program) one must be sensitive to organizational context and follow guidelines established by Lippitt (p.139) which include: (1) reducing restraining forces as a means of alleviating resistance and tension; (2) building norms; (3) building trust and communication; and (4) providing continuous support and rewards for changed behavior.

Lortie (1975) characterizes teachers and the organizational context within which they work. His discussion of organizational context in terms of the ethos and structure of the occupation as they relate change provide insight to one hoping to modify the classroom behavior of teachers. For example, he states that any program designed to modify the behavior of teachers will have to take into account the degree of reflexive conservatism evident in the norms of a particular school. Conservatism was one of the major factors of the ethos of the teaching occupation identified by Lortie in his Five Towns Interviews. According to Macdonald (1977), inservice educators operating in such situations might be looked upon as scholars-in-residence assessing and engaging in the

dynamic social structures of the school and the groups within the school in order to establish and maintain effective programs (pp.12-13).

The importance of organizational context variables in the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of inservice programs is likewise noted by Brandt (1977) in his discussion of the Child Study Movement. Brandt concludes that the affective nature of inservice settings greatly influences a program's implementation and that one must therefore consciously create a supportive social system bringing inservice educators and teachers together in an atmosphere of understanding (pp.10-51).

Joyce (1977) agrees with this conclusion and states, "Much more knowledge than is presently available is needed about the process of building an appropriate social climate for the inservice enterprise" (p.5). West (1977) corroborates the statement by Joyce and adds that many research questions have not attracted the attention of researchers in the past because they are too broad and too complex with too many variables and not enough controls. Research needs to be reconceptualized so that it treats important, global issues, gives direction to staff development programs, and improves the programs as it is being conducted (pp.42-44).

The significance of organizational context is well summarized by Lippitt and Fox (1971) who state that clarification of role relationships, the establishment of supportive group norms, the gaining of skill in performing a range of functions needed in effective group operation, and the development of a climate of openness, trust, and mutual support are learning goals which require involvement of the total organization in the inservice education program (p.140).

Involvement of the total organization is required in the provision of support systems needed in the operation of an inservice program. Support systems include materials, equipment, personnel, other physical, emotional, social, and intellectual resources which are intended to facilitate the achievement of program goals

and objectives. Jackson (1971) suggests that if educators either will not or can not provide teachers with adequate support systems as they engage in inservice education, then time is being wasted in discussing the reform of inservice education and attention should turn to "the more manageable task of redesigning the cumulative folder or enlarging the hot lunch service" (pp.29-39). In agreement with Jackson, Westby-Gibson (1967) concludes from her review of inservice education research that "prime time and adequate money" are essential to the effectiveness of a program. Likewise, Edelfelt (1977) lists time available during regular instructional hours, adequate personnel, materials, community resources, and funds as crucial aspects of inservice education (pp.19-21).

Joyce, McNair, Diaz, and McKibbin (1977) conclude from their interviews with 1,016 educators that the means for designing and implementing productive staff development programs exist, but that neglect of organizational characteristics and support systems have frustrated efforts to operationalize such programs (p.16). For example, obstacles to effective inservice education perceived by the respondents include: lack of local, state and federal assistance (25%); negative attitudes such as apathy, mistrust, and so forth (15%); and lack of teacher, local educational agency, and/or administrator support (5-10%).

Gant, South, Hansen (1977) emphasize the significance of time, energy, and money as resources to be distributed so that they maximize the success of various program activities and help achieve program goals. They caution:

Most organizations are concerned about costs and waste. The planners should keep in mind that the time of the personnel (planners, participants and staff) is the most expensive resource. Yet, this resource can be wasted because of lack of adequate supplies such as newsprint, felt markers, pencils, masking tape, paper, audiotapes, tinker toys, and copies of instructional materials.... Resources for support personnel, for office functions, handling transportation, etc., should be part of the budget (p.71).

The implication of this comment is that adequate support systems are critical to

program effectiveness.

Among the support systems of an organizational context which should be addressed by inservice education programs is the incentive and reward component. The rationale for providing both intrinsic and extrinsic incentives/rewards is based on the assumption that although learning under intrinsic motivation is preferable to learning under extrinsic motivation (Doll, 1974, pp.41), the use of extrinsic incentives/rewards might facilitate inservice programs during interim situations in which intrinsic motivation might not yet exist. It is felt that participation in effective inservice programs might in the long-run bring about intrinsic motivation and incentives/rewards for the participants. Brandt (1977) agrees that extrinsic incentive/rewards such as course credit, extra pay, free tuition, and released time stimulate attendance and nominal participation, but that only relevant inservice activities and considerable effort put forth by teachers will result in intrinsically rewarding inservice which has a substantial impact on participants (p.47).

Nicholson and Joyce (1977) report that the issue of incentives (or motivation or rewards) is widely discussed in the literature (p.42). There are already many recognized, traditional methods of motivating teachers to continue their education (Cory, undated). Incentives/rewards range from released time, stipends, and salary increments to intangibles such as local press coverage for accomplishments, increased proficiency, and satisfying professional relationships (Van Ryn and Santelli, 1976, pp.56-57). The problem is that frequently the available rewards do not have their intended motivational and/or reinforcement effects. Often the means in the traditional incentive scheme (accumulation of inservice units) has replaced the end (improved professional performance) (Nicholson and Joyce, pp.92-93).

Another problem stems from the fact that although most educators agree that there ought to be incentives/rewards for teachers who participate in inservice activities, there is considerable disagreement and confusion regarding the details of the issue (Joyce, McNair, Diaz, McKibbin, 1977, pp.28-32, 53). Educators do not agree on the strength and weaknesses of either the present or potential incentive systems. As indicated by Joyce and his colleagues, the respondents to an interview question about the major shortcomings in the current incentive system indicated that a variety of variables were responsible. Likewise, the educators who were interviewed perceived a variety of obstacles present which prevented improvement of the incentive system. Among the obstacles quoted were: negative teacher attitudes (3-16% depending on position); negative administrator attitudes (7-28%); poorly organized and implemented incentive system (5-14%); and lack of financial support from local education authorities, state and federal government (21-28%) (pp.28-32,53).

Joyce and his colleagues (1977) report that, in spite of obstacles, 62% of the teachers interviewed had participated in inservice education during the previous two years. The primary motivations for participation that were reported include: required participation (25%); professional growth and experience (25%); and miscellaneous responses (50%). The authors note that when asked to speculate on the kinds of things that would persuade them to take part in an inservice program, the teachers indicated a desire for professional growth (60%); undecided (20%); and miscellaneous factors such as planned incentives, contractual agreements, etc. (20%). Nicholson and Joyce conclude that overall, the 1,016 educators interviewed disagree considerably when addressing the issue of incentives for motivating teachers to participate in inservice training (pp.31-32, 53).

The implications of the preceding information become practically significant when one considers its implications for policy-making. For example, consider the

contrast between the statement by Van Ryn and one by Santelli (Van Ryn and Santelli, 1976) who disagree about the way in which funds for inservice education should be allocated. To quote Van Ryn:

I know that a significant amount of the dollars being used to support inservice education goes to reward teachers and other personnel for participating.... It just doesn't seem very rational to spend the bulk of the money devoted to inservice education to rewards and incentives, and spend the least amount of the money for the planning, designing and actual delivery of services.... We ought to think about, and jointly develop, some alternatives to the present incentive and reward structure (p.59).

Santelli's response indicates a different view:

A very old and traditional axiom in collective bargaining says that you don't give up something that you already earned. If we apply the notion that is being discussed here, that is exactly what people are asking teachers to do.... I think it is also erroneous to assume that the monies that are currently being paid to teachers in the form of (salary increments) should be channeled back into different ways of delivering inservice education (p.60).

This contrast of views presents an example of the inherent difficulties involved as one moves from acceptance of the assumption that effective inservice education requires intrinsic and extrinsic incentives/rewards to negotiation of policies based upon the assumption. The effort to resolve policy issues is worthwhile in terms of potential benefits. As summarized by Rubin (1971):

An interest in fine teaching does not occur as a matter of course, and even when it exists, it may be dissipated by excessive organizational constraints or by weak morale. We must make use of both intrinsic and extrinsic incentives to high achievement (p.261).

Thus, the technical literature does contain a reasonable level of consensus regarding effective inservice education programs. These agreements have been conceptualized into a three-dimensional framework of assumptions. While one dimension of the framework regards the means by which the content of such programs should be determined, the other two dimensions address the critical features of process and of context.

CHAPTER THREE

AN ANALYSIS OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES RELATED TO INSERVICE EDUCATION

Constructs which guide policy analysis appear to vary with the theoretical, political and/or academic orientation of the evaluator. In the analysis which follows, procedures were derived more from the academic domain than from other sources. Consequently, the study of policies and practices followed a pattern by which selected components were isolated, analyzed and synthesized through the identification of conceptual linkages which could be used to construct references to the issues.

Procedures used in this examination include the following:

1. Identify an assumptive framework for inservice education from the technical literature on this topic.
2. Select specific Federal Rules and Regulations pertaining to inservice education from the collection of program rules and regulations governing Teacher Corps.
3. Formulate observations regarding the probable linkage of Federal Rules and Regulations with the technical literature on inservice education.
4. Analyze selected Teacher Corps Federal Rules and Regulations on inservice education from a "critical mass" perspective.
5. Relate practices of six Teacher Corps projects to both the Federal Rules and Regulations and the technical literature.
6. Synthesize findings regarding the features of Federal Rules and Regulations, assumptive framework and operational practices for inservice education.

Procedure One: Identify an Assumptive Framework for Inservice Education from the Technical Literature on this Topic

The assumptive framework has been designed to include three dimensions-- content, process and context. Within each dimension, specific assumptions

have been identified. First, Townsend (1979) examined the literature and constructed five assumptions regarding effective inservice education (Chapter Two). Following her study of inservice teacher education in Houston, Texas, she refined the five assumptions into a collection of nine revised statements. This framework is reported in Table 1 on the following two pages.

Procedure Two: Select Specific Federal Rules and Regulations Pertaining to Inservice Education From the Collection of Program Rules and Regulations Governing Teacher Corps

The function of Procedure Two is to explicate the inservice education policies of the Teacher Corps Program. In order to define these policies, the following stipulations were acknowledged:

1. The basis of Federal policy is derived from the statutes which authorize programs.
2. The statute which includes the Teacher Corps Program is Title V-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.
3. Regulations for Teacher Corps (Part 172) were publicized in the Federal Register of February 23, 1978.

The following Rules and Regulations were selected from the published Teacher Corps Program announcement. Since Procedure Two of this analysis has been established to clarify Federal policy on inservice education in Teacher Corps, both the general policy as endorsed by the Congress and the specific policy conditions as expressed in the Rules and Regulations has been included in the following presentation policy.

Federal Policy: Inservice Education
Through Teacher Corps

A. Policy Statement: Congress

Part A of Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as Amended--
Teacher Corps Program Statement of Purpose and Authorization of
Appropriations

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF THE ASSUMPTIVE FRAMEWORK

Dimensions of the Assumptive Framework for Inservice Education	Original Assumptions Extracted from Technical Literature	Revised Assumptions Extracted from the Townsend Study
1.00 Content	1.10 Effective inservice teacher education utilizes techniques that are consistent with fundamental principles of effective teaching and learning (that is, needs based content, field-based instruction, demonstrations, active learning, practice of skills, and feedback). (Bush, 1971; Joyce and Showers, 1977; Lawrence and others, 1974; and Rubin, 1971)	1.11 Effective inservice teacher education programs provide needs-based content. 1.12 Effective inservice teacher education programs provide field-based instruction. 1.13 Effective inservice teacher education programs provide strategies of active learning.
26 2.00 Processes	2.10 Effective inservice teacher education utilizes a systemic model of program design, development, implementation, and evaluation. (Bush, 1971; Fischler, 1971; Seriven, 1974; and Unruh, 1975) 2.20 Effective inservice teacher education utilizes a parity-based collaborative decision-making process. (Allen, 1971; Drummond, 1976, Edelfelt, 1977; Jeffers and McDaniels, 1975; Lawrence and others, 1974; and Smith, 1975)	2.11 Effective inservice teacher education programs manifest systemic and parity-based collaborative processes

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF THE ASSUMPTIVE FRAMEWORK (cont'd)

Dimensions of the Assumptive Framework for Inservice Education	Original Assumptions Extracted from Technical Literature	Revised Assumptions Extracted from the Townsend Study
3.00 Context	3.10 Effective inservice teacher education takes into account organizational context and support systems. (Hall, 1977; Lortie, 1975; Lippit and Fox, 1971; Rubin, 1971; and Tikunoff and Ward, 1977)	3.11 Effective inservice teacher education programs establish and maintain concise, open, and clearly understood communication systems.
	3.20 Effective inservice teacher education provides both intrinsic and extrinsic incentives/rewards. (Brandt, 1977; Bush, 1971; Edelfelt, 1977; and Van Ryn and Santelli, 1976)	3.12 Effective inservice teacher education programs provide intangible and tangible support systems.
		3.13 Effective inservice teacher education programs provide for analysis of past innovative experiences of the participants and use the information to guide current programmatic processes.
		3.14 Effective inservice teacher education programs provide for analysis of central administration goals, procedures, and policies and use the information to guide current programmatic processes.
		3.15 Effective inservice teacher education programs provide for analysis of organizational climate of a given school and use the information to guide programmatic processes.

Sec. 511. (a) The purpose of this part is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation and to encourage institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve programs of training and retraining for teachers, teacher aides, and other educational personnel by--

(1) Attracting and training qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies for teaching in such areas;

(2) Attracting and training inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available for teaching and in-service training to local educational agencies in such areas in teams led by an experienced teacher;

(3) Attracting volunteers to serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants in programs carried out by local educational agencies and institutions of higher education serving such areas;

(4) Attracting and training educational personnel to provide relevant remedial, basic and secondary educational training, including literacy and communications skills for juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders;

(5) Supporting demonstration projects for retraining experienced teachers, teacher aides, and other educational personnel serving in local educational agencies.

Policy Key Points:

1. *Institutions are expected to improve inservice programs by:*
 - a. *attracting and training teachers for areas having concentrations of low-income families.*
 - b. *training teams of inexperienced teacher-interns led by experienced teachers for educational agencies in areas having concentrations of low-income families.*
 - c. *attracting volunteer tutors or full-time instructional assistants for LEA or IHE programs in areas having concentrations of low-income families.*
 - d. *attracting and training educational personnel to provide services for juvenile delinquents, youth offenders and adult criminal offenders.*
 - e. *supporting demonstration projects for retraining in local educational agencies.*

B. Policy Statement: Teacher Corps Program Rules and Regulations

Subpart A: General

172.2: Purpose. The purpose of the Teacher Corps Program is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low income families, to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation, and to encourage institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve programs of training and retraining for teachers, teacher aides, and other educational personnel.

Policy Key Point: Institutions of higher education and local educational agencies are encouraged to improve programs of training and retraining for teachers, teacher aides, and other educational personnel.

Subpart B: Elements of a Teacher Corps Project

Participants

172.10: Joint Participants. (b) A project may also include participation by a State educational agency. The State educational agency may participate by providing training to the Teacher Corps members.

Policy Key Point: State educational agencies may participate in providing training to the Teacher Corps members.

172.13: Involvement of all educational school personnel in the project. All educational personnel employed by a project school must be involved in planning and carrying out the project in that school.

Policy Key Point: All educational personnel employed in the project schools must be involved in inservice training.

172.17: Involvement of State educational agency. (a) The State educational agency must be kept informed of the progress and experience of the project, including, (b) Project matters which would contribute to the improvement of State teacher certification requirements.

Policy Key Point: State educational agencies must be informed of inservice practices which would contribute to the improvement of State teacher certification requirements.

Project Program

172.41: Achievement of objectives during the remaining four years.

(a) During the remaining four years of a project, activities must be carried out which are designed to achieve the objectives adopted under 172.61-172.66. (b) Activities during this period must consist primarily of training.

Policy Key Point: Activities during Years 2-5 must consist primarily of training. Since Intern training is completed by the beginning of Year 4, the final two years may be exclusively inservice training.

172.43: Institution of higher education functions. An institution of higher education may perform the following functions under its grant: (b) Training Teacher Corps members.

172.44: Local educational agency functions. A local educational agency may perform the following functions under its grant: (b) Training Teacher Corps members. (c) Paying the compensation of Teacher Corps members.

Policy Key Point: Either the IHE or LEA may provide the inservice training.

172.45: Training by institutions of higher education. (a) Each institution of higher education which receives a grant under this part shall provide training to Teacher Corps members. This must include training designed to achieve the objectives adopted under 172.62(b) (improvement of competency of educational personnel). (b) An institution of higher education which does not offer academic course-work beyond the bachelor's degree level may provide training for volunteers and teacher aides, if this type of training is designed to achieve the objectives adopted under 172.62.

Policy Key Point: Inservice shall be provided by the IHE to Teacher Corps members and the training must be designed to achieve the improvement of competency of educational personnel.

172.46: Pre-service and in-service training. Training under this part must include pre-service training for teacher-interns and in-service training for other educational personnel employed by the project schools.

Policy Key Point: Inservice must include other educational personnel employed by project schools. (Other educational personnel means administrators, supervisors, and other specialized educational personnel).

172.48: Graduate level training for teachers and teacher-interns. Training for teachers and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree must be at the graduate level. Training for teacher-interns who do not have a bachelor's degree may be at the undergraduate level.

Policy Key Point: Inservice training must be at the graduate level.

172.50: Field and community based training. Training of Teacher Corps members must be primarily field based and carried out in the community served by the project.

Policy Key Point: Inservice must be primarily field based and conducted in the community.

172.51: Training for volunteers. A grantee may provide training to volunteers to prepare them for service in the project.

Policy Key Point: Inservice may include volunteers in the project schools.

172.52: Documentation of project experience. (a) Each project must include documentation of all significant factors which influence project experience and results, including: 1) The characteristics and conditions of the local setting; and 2) The usefulness of project processes, practices, and products in the project schools. (b) The documentation under paragraph (a) of this section must be used to: 1) Review progress in accomplishing the objectives developed under 172.61-172.65; and 2) Revise those objectives if necessary.

Policy Key Point: Inservice must be documented such that characteristics and conditions of the local setting are reported, usefulness of processes, practices and products is determined, progress toward professional development objectives is reported and objectives for professional development are changed if appropriate.

Basic Outcomes and Project Objectives

172.60: Basic Outcomes. Each project must be designed to achieve the following outcomes: (a) An improved school climate which fosters the learning of children of low-income families. (b) An improved educational personnel development system for persons who serve or who are preparing to serve in schools for children of low-income families. (c) The continuation of educational improvements (including products, processes, and practices) made as a result of the project, after Federal funding ends. (d) The adoption or adaptation of those educational improvements by other educational agencies and institutions.

Policy Key Point: Inservice must focus on all outcomes. Persons participating in the inservice should serve or be preparing to serve schools for children of low-income families.

172.61: Project Objectives. (a) Each project must include objectives which are designed to achieve the outcomes described in 172.60.

Policy Key Point: Each project must have inservice related objectives.

172.62: School Objectives. (a) Each project must include specific objectives designed to achieve the outcome under 172.60(a) (improved school climate) in each of the project schools. These objectives may include curriculum, organization, or other changes that affect an entire school. All project schools must jointly participate in the development of these specific objectives. (1) Improve the competency of all educational personnel employed by the project schools (and the teacher-interns) to provide education that is multicultural and to be knowledgeable of the sensitivity to the needs of diverse cultures, regardless of the pupil population served by the project; (2) Improve the competency of these educational personnel, and the teacher interns, and the project schools, to deal with a wide range of variability in children; and (3) Provide all educational personnel employed by the project schools (and the teacher-interns) with the opportunity to improve their competency to identify children with learning and behavioral problems,

diagnose the special needs of those children, and prescribe learning activities to meet those needs.

Policy Key Point: *The inservice program must be structured to improve the competencies of all educational personnel employed in the project schools. Furthermore, the inservice must have objectives associated with multicultural education, student variability, learning and behavioral problems and diagnostic and prescriptive teaching.*

172.63: Educational personnel development systems objectives. Each project must include specific objectives designed to achieve the outcome under 172.60(b) (improved educational personnel development system), including objectives to achieve: (a) Basic and systemic improvements in the methods used by the institution of higher education and the local educational agency to train educational personnel; (b) The development of the capacity of the institution of higher education to provide training that will achieve the objectives under 172.63(b); and (c) Provision of pre-service and inservice training as an integral process.

Policy Key Point: *Inservice programs must aim to improve educational personnel development systems. Such improvements should be system oriented for both the IHE and LEA. Furthermore, the IHE should develop the capacity through the inservice to deal with the objectives of Teacher Corps. Inservice should also be developed to link with pre-service.*

172.64: Institutionalization objectives. Each project must include specific objectives designed to achieve the outcome under 172.60(c) (continuation of educational improvements).

Policy Key Point: *Inservice program should address the condition of continued educational improvement.*

172.65: Demonstration and dissemination objectives. Each project must include specific objectives designed to achieve the outcome under 172.60(d) (adaptation of educational improvements by other agencies) by demonstrating and disseminating project processes, practices, and products found useful in the project schools to: (a) Persons involved in the project. (b) Schools of the local educational agency and components of the institution of higher education which are not involved in the project; (c) Other local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and communities; and (d) Others interested in educational policy.

Policy Key Point: *Inservice programs must address the outcomes regarding demonstration and dissemination. Consequently, if the inservice program is found to be useful in the project schools (an implied evaluation of inservice) then the adaptation of the program, processes or products by other agencies is an expectation.*

Teacher Corps Members

172.91: Training stipends for teachers and other educational personnel.

(a) The institution of higher education or local educational agency may pay a training stipend to each of the teachers and other educational personnel employed by a project school who participate in training under this part during a period of the year (if any) not covered by a local employment contract. (b) The training stipend may be at a rate of not more than \$100 per individual per week, prorated if the training is part-time. (c) A local educational agency shall use funds under its grant to pay up to 100 percent of the cost of stipends paid under this section.

Policy Key Point: Inservice may provide stipends for participants during the time they are not covered by a local employment contract.

172.92: Released time for educational personnel. (a) If authorized by the Commissioner, the local educational agency may use funds under its grant to pay the cost of releasing educational personnel from their regular duties in a project school to participate in training under this part. (b) The Commissioner may authorize a local educational agency to use funds under paragraph (a) of this section if the local educational agency demonstrates in its application that the project is or will be placed in jeopardy by the lack of compensation for released time.

Policy Key Point: Released time may be a condition of inservice participation.

A summary of Federal policy on inservice as defined by the Congress and by Teacher Corps rules and regulations is included in Table 2 on the following page.

In summary, Federal policy on inservice education through Teacher Corps is both general and specific. The Congress appears to have directed its focus toward institutional improvement in this area while the Teacher Corps Program mandates eleven program conditions and allows for discretionary judgment in nine areas. While most of the critical features of the program are mandated, the areas of rewards and incentives are among the optional conditions for inservice education.

Procedure Three: Formulate Observations Regarding the Probable Linkage of Federal Rules and Regulations with the Technical Literature on Inservice Education

The linkage or alignment of Federal policy with the technical literature was examined for the purpose of drawing attention to knowledge utilization processes at the Federal level. In order to engage in this review, the content

TABLE 3

SUMMARY: FEDERAL POLICY--INSERVICE THROUGH TEACHER CORPS

Sources of Federal Policy on Inservice Education

Congress	Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations	
	Requirements	Options
Institutions should improve inservice programs by: ● attracting/training teachers for low-income areas ● training teams of inexperienced teacher-interns for educational agencies in low-income areas ● attracting volunteers for LEA and IHE programs in low-income areas ● attracting/training educational personnel for juvenile delinquents, youth offenders and adult criminal offenders ● supporting demonstration projects for training	● All educational personnel in cluster schools must be involved in planning and carrying out inservice ● SEA must be informed of practices which would improve certification ● Activities during Years 2-5 must consist primarily of training ● Inservice shall be provided by IHE ● Training must be designed to improve competency of educational personnel ● Inservice must be graduate level ● Inservice must be field-based and conducted in the community ● Inservice must be documented ● Inservice must focus on all project outcomes ● Each project must have inservice related objectives ● Inservice must aim to improve personnel development systems.	● LEA and IHE encouraged to improve programs ● SEA may participate ● Final two years may be exclusively inservice ● Either the LEA or IHE may provide inservice ● Inservice may include volunteers in project schools ● Inservice should be linked to pre-service education ● Inservice should address continued educational improvement ● Inservice may provide stipends ● Released time may be a condition of inservice participation

included on Tables 1 and 2 as juxtaposed and observations were developed regarding the extent to which Federal policy appeared to reflect the consensus which was drawn from the technical literature by Townsend. Furthermore, the dimensions of the assumptive framework were utilized to analyze the implications of the results of this comparison.

1. Regarding the content dimension of the assumptive framework.

The technical literature yielded three assumptions regarding the identification of the content of inservice--effective inservice should be needs-based, field-based and provide strategies of active learning. Teacher Corps Program policy include points on explicit policy statement among the mandated conditions for the field-based assumption. While it is possible to interpret some of the other policy statements to reflect the needs-based and active learning assumptions, these conditions are not explicitly treated at the Federal level.

2. Regarding the process dimension of the assumptive framework.

The analysis of the technical literature emphasized the importance of systemic and parity-based collaborative processes. Many of the mandated and optional requirements for inservice in Teacher Corps reflect both of these conditions. For example, the reference to the importance of systemic collaboration is apparent in the policies which specify that all educational personnel must participate in the inservice as well as the stipulation that state educational agencies must be informed of practices which would improve certification. In addition, the collaboration which was highlighted in the technical literature is clearly evident at the policy level in the stipulation that "personnel must be involved in planning and carrying out inservice." Another illustration of this point is in the option that either the LEA or IHE may provide inservice and that the SEA may also participate.

3. Regarding the context dimension of the assumptive framework.

Five assumptions were recognized as pertaining to the context dimension. These assumptions included references to the need for both communication and support systems for inservice programs in addition to the importance of providing an analysis of past experiences, administrative processes and organizational climate. The policy statements are more explicit regarding the support systems than they are for any of the other four conditions. Again, some of the policy statements may be interpreted to apply to these areas but only in the recognition of the need for inservice for all educational personnel (support personnel included) does Federal policy explicate one of the features which was derived from the literature.

In summary, the comparison of Federal policy using the technical literature on inservice as criteria leads to the conclusion that such policy is far more explicit with regard to the process dimension of the assumptive framework than it is with either the content or context areas. This observation may be useful in an analysis of the interdependence of content, process and context. What are the effects on inservice programs when policy is more stipulative in the process area and more discretionary in the content and context areas? Does this practice simply reflect the strategy at the Federal level to stipulate policy regarding process as a means to insure equity in these programs? If the Federal policy strategy was to encourage project-level interpretations of the content and context dimensions, how does this approach influence the implementation of stipulated policies regarding the process dimension?

Questions of this type draw attention to the need to examine the content, process and context framework from a knowledge exchange perspective. With the technical literature as criteria, this appraisal of policy indicates that Teacher Corps developed a policy framework that included both mandated and discretionary

conditions. The classification of the literature led to the conclusion that the program policies were more clearly specified for the processes of inservice and more conditional and open for local translation for the content and context areas.

Procedure Four: Analyze selected Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations on inservice education from a "critical mass" perspective.

Decisions made regarding the distribution of resources within institutions are reflective of the values and priorities of these organizations. Such decisions are equally revealing of the key persons who engage in the critical processes by which goods and services are allocated. Furthermore, these decisions can reflect institutional strategies for change and development. One approach to the problem of distribution is to spread equally the available resources to all constituents. Another strategy is to allocate resources with discretion to the extent that certain projects or clients obtain more than others. This latter strategy has been referred to as a "critical mass concept" and is often defended on the basis that the careful distribution of resources to selected projects or processes will not only reflect an agenda for action but will also permit the decision maker to increase resources to selected priority targets. Policy makers who select the critical mass concept usually recognize that fewer constituents are being served immediately. However, this approach is often defended on the grounds that long-range benefits will be available by first concentrating on a limited area.

As policy makers consider the alternative strategies for the distribution of resources, one of their central concerns pertains to problems associated with increases in program effectiveness. Estimates are made regarding the relationships between the level of allocation and the subsequent impact these resources will have on program production. Regarding these estimates, Dougharty (1979)

observed that three options are available to the policy maker.

First, there is a relationship of declining marginal returns to expenditures. That is, the next dollar spent buys less of the effectiveness measure than the last dollar. Under the declining returns theory, the most efficient policy would be to spread available funds over as wide a population as practical. Second, a policy based on the theory of increasing returns can be adopted. Increasing returns (over some region of expenditure) implies that the critical mass policy of concentrating funds would be a reasonable allocation of compensatory funds. Third, policy can be based on the belief that there is no relationship between expenditures and achievement gain. (p.5)

Therefore, in applying the critical mass concept to Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations for inservice education, the intent was to scrutinize Teacher Corps policy and determine the extent of internal consistency which is evident in these program guidelines. This type of analysis was constructed for the purpose of examining the extent to which the policy structure supports the "demonstration" feature mandated for all Teacher Corps Projects. Consequently, the logic of this appraisal is based on the following deduction:

1. Since Teacher Corps is a demonstration project, policy makers are primarily interested in increasing the returns from resources allocated to each project. (The theory of increasing returns involves the critical mass strategy.)
2. Resources allocated to projects should be distributed according to Teacher Corps policies regarding inservice education.
3. Teacher Corps policies consistently should support practices which will lead to increasing returns from resources allocated to each project.
4. Therefore, any policy statement which allows for practices which are not likely to increase returns from resources will limit the chances of a successful demonstration at the project level.

The initial frame of reference for this analysis regards the internal consistency which is evident when policy makers stipulate that all educational personnel must be involved with the inservice program and also stipulate

selected conditions for these programs. For example, inservice programs in Teacher Corps must be designed to improve competency and must be field-based and conducted in the community. Given the variations in professional development which are apparent in any collection of "all" educational personnel, is it likely that all will improve through field-based programs conducted in the community? Consequently, a policy statement which not only mandates the involvement of all participants but also specifies conditions of participation may not be appropriate for all and can be judged as inconsistent.

Another example of the inconsistency which is apparent in the program policies pertains to the requirement that inservice must focus on all project outcomes and must be at the graduate level. The assumption which appears to be undergirding these two policies is that all Teacher Corps outcomes can or should be addressed at graduate level training. While it is recognized that no one standard of graduate level study is consistently applied throughout the institutions of higher education, the observation may also be advanced that all Teacher Corps outcomes may not meet the criteria of graduate study in selected institutions. For example, it is conceivable that some outcomes may emphasize the implementation of selected instructional practices without an attending focus on the theoretical bases of such activities. Many critics of schools of education have claimed that this type of activity, while important to the profession, should not be considered equivalent to the scholarly work required in graduate level study.

Another frame of reference regarding the extent to which Teacher Corps policies reflect critical mass concepts is the impact of requiring "all" participants to be involved and "all" outcomes to be emphasized. Given the nature of the demonstration phenomena and the need to focus on specific roles and goals, the provisions for "all" participants and "all" goals appears to complicate the

demonstration phenomena. To illustrate, it appears that the decision to consider Teacher Corps a demonstration project was based, in part, on the theory of increasing returns from resources allocated for these projects. Yet, the two policy statements which mandate "all" participants and "all" outcomes have the impact of supporting a declining marginal return on the program investment. As more participants are added to a demonstration and as more outcomes are included in these exemplars, the return on each dollar of investment is reduced. Each additional participant and each additional outcome reduces the effectiveness of the demonstration. Therefore, the policy conditions which mandate comprehensive demonstrations subvert the effectiveness of that which is being demonstrated.

In summary, the analysis of Teacher Corps Policy on inservice education using the criteria of critical mass leads to the conclusion that the mandated conditions contain several inconsistencies which may seriously influence the demonstrations at the Project level. The inconsistencies appear to represent a double bind for a project since each local unit is expected to both develop comprehensive inservice programs which incorporate all participants and all objectives and simultaneously demonstrate the effectiveness of selected components of the training which occurs through Teacher Corps. These competing demands appear to be directing local policy makers to distribute resources both to achieve a comprehensive program (declining returns theory) and a demonstrable training element (increasing returns or critical mass concepts). Confusion of this type at the local policy level probably will limit the development of demonstrable components through Teacher Corps.

Procedure Five: Relate Practices of Six Teacher Corps Projects to Both the Federal Rules and Regulations and to the Technical Literature

Another type of analysis associated with policy implementation involves the identification of specific anecdotes which describe the conditions of installation.

While these descriptions portray only a small portion of the interactions which occur at the project level, the details of each example tend to illustrate the highly complex nature of the processes of knowledge exchange during the implementation of policies. Thus, the purpose of Procedure Five in this analysis is to preview the range of implementation situations which were evident in the six projects which participated in the cluster activity. This preview will also serve as a basis for applying a forecasting method which may be useful as a front-end analysis of policy statements. Information used in this phase was supplied by each project in the form of anecdotes and in terms of the time involved during the implementation processes. The anecdotes are organized according to the assumptive framework which consists of inservice content, process and context, and the technical literature associated with each of those dimensions. In addition anecdotes are applied to selected stipulations included in the Federal policies for inservice in Teacher Corps.

First, according to the literature, the agenda of effective inservice should be determined by a needs assessment, instructional content should be field-based and the content should be delivered using strategies of active learning. An example of the complexities one encounters in determining content is presented in:

Anecdote 1: When can we do the needs assessment?

Like the elusive "El Dorado" sought after by early American explorers, "the right time" for offering inservice activities has been sought after by the Teacher Corps inservice coordinators. This is how the academic year unfolds:

"September," says the Principal, "is not a good time for Teacher Corps inservice. We have teachers burning the candle at both ends just trying to get organized for the year. There is so much paperwork to do at the beginning of the year."

"October," the Counselor noted, "is the worst time for Teacher Corps inservice. The teachers are all very occupied--before, during, and after school--with preparing for and conducting parent conferences. District policy places these conferences in top priority status. A great deal

of time and money goes into the effort."

"November," explained the teacher representative, "is a relatively slow month, in spite of the Thanksgiving break. I think we teachers would have time for a couple of meetings so that we can talk to you program specialists face-to-face and explain to you exactly what we feel we need in the area of inservice training." (PROGRESS AT LAST! We had some planning meetings.)

"December," wailed another teacher, "is a crazy month. We have meetings, programs, and/or parties scheduled for every day right up 'til vacation. I just can't spare any time this month for inservice workshops."

"January," commented the Counselor, "is another hectic month with end-of-the-semester activities and another parent conference week. I don't think teachers will have much time or energy for inservice activities."

"February and March," the inservice coordinators decided, "are the best months for activities. We'll organize a couple of short workshops for thirty minutes after school each week. The teachers made it clear that they did not want to stay after school for more than thirty minutes because they have too much going on in their personal lives." (SO WE ENGAGED IN TWO FRANTIC MONTHS OF ACTIVITY.)

"April," concluded the Principal, "is not a good time for asking teachers to participate in inservice training. We have spring vacation and standardized testing scheduled for April. Teachers are overwhelmed with before and after school obligations."

"May," explained the teacher representative, "isn't such a good time to have inservice workshops. Teachers are burned out and just too tired to attend then."

Inservice coordinators may never find "the right time" for inservice activities. Our project uses district inservice days and summer vacation time for professional development activities, and we try to arrange some activities for during the regular school day. Problems associated with that solution comprise another whole story.

Yet, in Anecdote 2, the exemplar describes another reaction to the needs assessment task:

Anecdote 2: Documentation in a Time Capsule

The Teacher Corps project documents involvement in the school climate outcome as a series of activities that influence the change process. In addition, the project uses the technique of a "time capsule" for comparing baseline perceptions of school climate with perceptions following intervention activities. An outline of the preparation for a school climate conference with inservice teachers, building administrators, and parents follows.

1. January, 1980. Each team member prepared a baseline narrative description of school climate from the perspective of their project functions.
2. February, 1980. Each team member identified the need for a commonly shared definition of school climate and a project stance.
3. March, 1980. Each team member shared position papers with each other from the perspective of their own roles as follows: School climate--
 - and the community (Community Coordinator)
 - and teacher/teacher; teacher/administrator (Team Leader)
 - and teacher/child (Special Education Coordinator)
 - and organizational structure/context (Director)
 - and curriculum successes:
 - . science exemplar (Inservice Coordinator)
 - . multicultural exemplar (Multicultural Coordinator)
 - and interns (Team Leader/Director)
4. March, 1980. The Director discussed plans for the School Climate Conference with the teacher association president and the school district's curriculum director. Approval for data collection using a baseline "sealed time capsule" was obtained. Conference plans were built with building level School Site Councils, through Inservice Coordinator.
5. April, 1980. The Inservice Coordinator presented preliminary program for conference for team review. Team members added exemplars to the position papers, shared them, and refined the conference program. School Site Council members provided input to the working draft of the program.
6. May, 1980. The School Climate Conference was held. Participants placed individual baseline perceptions of school climate into the "time capsule" for each school. Instruments include structured rating scales, prioritizing of needs, and open-ended narratives. Time capsules were sealed for a year and will be compared with data collected in May, 1981.

The second dimension of the assumptive framework regarded processes to be used with inservice programs and according to the literature, those processes should use both a systemic approach to program development and collaborative decision making. The following brief editorial may indicate the doubts of one director from the six projects regarding the emphasis on a systemic model of program design:

Anecdote 3: What is a Systemic Model?

...What it says is, If you have kids who are learning and who know they are learning, and if you have professionals who can provide those opportunities, then the whole school climate will change. It's so simple, it's frightening, and that's why I say I am really not too sure if it's coming out of that morass of convoluted thinking with the bureaucrats in Washington. Obviously, somebody put some careful thought in it, and I have to give them that credit because I think those last two things are the key to the teaching, learning situation. If teachers feel like they are teaching and their kids are learning and both sides of that little model are interacting, it can't help but produce a good school.

Likewise, the process of collaborative decision-making which was emphasized in the technical literature often may not appear helpful as described by another director.

Anecdote 4: Is the Sky Falling or is it an Acorn?

The president of the Black Teachers' Caucus invited the Teacher Corps director to a conference behind the gymnasium. Footsteps echoed along the empty locker rooms as the director was led through an empty lavatory to the president's office. All tooth and dimple for forty-five minutes, the essence of this meeting follows:

President. Teacher Corps is really not a credible group. The staff doesn't represent the school district's population.

Director. We welcome your help in recruitment and identifying staff sources. The university is truly not representative but it is something that we cannot control.

President. You know, Director, the '70's were pretty cool but the '80's are going to get hot. The university is just pimping on this school district.

Director. You do need to know that the people on staff are the best possible people for the job and are committed to the kids and teachers in this district. Do beware that, if you attack the credibility of this project, you may be killing the goose that lays golden eggs.

President. Oh, while you're here, here's my letter of reference for T. (black teacher) for the team leader search.

Director. (reading) Are you recommending her personally or as the candidate of the Black Teachers' Caucus?

President. Oh, personally only.

The entry of boys for their gymn class ends the meeting.

Postscript: T. and the Cycle 12 team leader (S) were on the short list of four candidates sent by the advisory committee to the Policy Board. The Policy Board ranked S. first and T. fourth for the Superintendent's recommendation. The Superintendent appointed T. as the Program '79 team leader.

The context dimension of the assumptive framework included an emphasis on the development of inservice programs which recognize selected organizational factors such as support systems for participants and the incentive/reward structure. The complexity of this dimension is illustrated in the following letter sent by a project director to the Teacher Corps National Program Specialist for the Exceptional Child Component.

Anecdote 5: Abruptly Terminated or Thrown Out?

Another development in the School of Education has been my proposal of a course for 'receiving teachers' on the subject of mainstreaming children in early childhood education. It has recently passed the entire School of Education after passing through the Executive Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Department of Special Education, and the Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education. This process has taken an entire semester, lots of meetings, and some personal diplomacy. I have even had the singular experience of being abruptly terminated (thrown out of?) from a Department of Special Education meeting by a faculty member who was hesitant about the cross-listing of the course between the two departments and its team teaching. This person, one of the two tenured members of his department, has pressured untenured faculty to keep the bricks and mortar between departments reinforced...or else... He even attempted to intimidate our project's magnificent Special Education Coordinator, sort of suggesting that her tenure might be in question if she spent too much time released to the project. (She only attends all department meetings, keeps a full set of office hours for students, chairs the Executive Committee, sits on departmental writing teams, etc.) After my intervention with the Chairperson, then our mutual appeal to the Dean, and his reassurances to the Special Education Coordinator, the situation for this year and next year has been settled.

With the reduced resources available for Project '79, our approach has been to take a counterintuitive approach and to see where less can become more. The setting of priorities will be for (a) programs that support cooperative endeavors and (b) those activities that are more likely to serve best for institutionalization possibilities and dissemination functions. Reality means cresting the inevitable earthquakes and scapegoating directed to the "change agents" with a degree of buoyancy and a positive outlook for the longer-range organizational views--and hoping that the clients will claim credit for much of what

we have introduced. Then we will know that institutionalization has succeeded.

Another point during which the organizational context is magnified is during the planning for reorganization within highly structured institutions.

The example which follows provides a brief glimpse of these complexities:

Anecdote 6: The Inevitable Earthquake or is That What You Heard?

The Junior High School principal and the Teacher Corps School Site Council (SSC) (multiethnic constituency) have supported the teachers' recommendations to propose a school reorganization into clusters next year. The elected Community Council and the district's central administrators supported the notion. The teachers' "Alternative Structures Sub-Committee Study Group" reported alternatives and supported the concept, developed a timeline, and administrative tasks. The departmental chairpersons' group approved the concept and discussed the issue with their departments.

Upon entry to the Junior High School building, the Teacher Corps director was greeted by:

Teacher: Some of the teachers are saying that the cluster organization is a plot to let go black teachers next year.

Director: OK, which teachers are into this?

Teacher: Sylvia, I think, but Joe probably got to her.

Director: That means Joe's (teacher chairperson of the (SSC) who is Black) 180° turn around at the meeting wasn't real. I'll ask the Team Leader (who is Black) to get to each of them.

Later that week, Joe meets the director at the mailboxes.

Joe (smiling): Hey, I didn't turn Sylvia into that racist track. She's just looking for an issue--as usual--and nobody else is listening.

Implementation is also influenced by the actions of the Congress in establishing program purposes and by national program offices in developing selected rules and regulations (Table 2). Often persons involved at the Federal level are puzzled by local implementation practices which do not appear to be consistent with their intent. As an example, one director provided the following testimony to the central concern of Teacher Corps.

Anecdote 7: Students of Low-income Families

One of the chief difficulties of any Teacher Corps Program, unless it is placed in a very poverty stricken area or a deeply economically depressed area, is a lack of public recognition that students who come from low-income families have a special situation.

This is the fourth Teacher Corps program I have worked in. The first three were based in rural communities where it was almost sinful to consider yourself poor. People would talk about being poor on the surface as if it were some common thing shared such as during the great depression in this country. People can speak of themselves as being poor but certainly do not believe they are poor. The essence of this is that when one lives in a rural community being poor is not necessarily bad. However, to be identified technically as being poor tends to create a psychology against a program such as Teacher Corps. In almost every instance of communities in six school districts in the two-year cycle programs, when I would start talking "poor and the programs serving the poor," I would suffer almost a back-lash reaction. Statements like "the U.S. Government and universities and public schools are so busy doing things for the poor that they don't really have time for the folks that matter," and "all those poor people are on Welfare have no way nor a desire to support themselves," were common reactions.

The influence of such thinking on the part of the public, including classroom teachers, administrators, boards of education, and university personnel who work in those particular areas created a tendency to look at Teacher Corps with a jaundiced eye. I understand the politics of identifying and making very clear that Teacher Corps does in fact serve children who come from families where there is a high concentration of low incomes. It is inevitable for projects, especially those that operate in rural communities, to low-profile poverty guidelines. Sometimes I think it takes the sting out of the poverty labeling, and if a project chooses a strategy which in fact improves instruction, it's almost guaranteed to improve the instruction of kids from low-income families. The rationale for this being that if a teacher being trained to the extent that the teacher knows it is his/her responsibility to develop a supportive climate for learning, and if that teacher is taught to deal with the individual differences in all kids regardless of income cut offs, then that teacher will in fact use newly acquired skills because it makes it better for him/her in the classroom. I support the statutory intent of the policy that policy stringently sells the concept of poor. However, in rural communities, there should be some leeway given to projects, not necessarily to circumvent the poverty guideline requirement, but certainly which would allow us to temper our emphases.

In another example, the problems of implementing a training demonstration are well documented as experienced at the school level.

Anecdote 8: The Service vs. Demonstration Dilemma: The Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team is meeting to discuss an evaluation report which was written by the district evaluator and disseminated to both district and project personnel. Discussion is focused upon a written statement which suggested that low attendance at inservice workshops was a problem which should be immediately resolved by the inservice coordinators. The conversation flows as follows:

Director: "Ours is a demonstration project concerned with the development of new models for personnel development. Given the financial and time parameters within which we must operate, our staff has decided to emphasize direct formal and informal communication with teachers for the purpose of accurately assessing their needs and the context within which they work. We will concentrate on the development of two creative models for inservice and pre-service education which will be expanded later on. Ours is not a service project."

Evaluator: "I know you are concerned with building innovative programs, but it really is not very efficient to put so much effort into the development of an activity which is attended by maybe 10 teachers. Shouldn't you offer lots of activities involving lots of teachers?"

Program Specialist: "If we went that route, then all our time would be taken up with logistics (e.g., telephoning and writing consultants, processing forms, publicizing events, arranging locations and refreshments, etc.). This is not a very effective use of the time and expertise of program specialists who have doctorate degrees in teacher education. It takes a lot of effort to appease, accommodate, and make happy a lot of teachers, which is what you are asking us to do. Developing and testing new models is quite different from coordinating numerous traditional inservice "dog and pony" shows.

The dilemma prevails: service to 300 teachers in the district vs. research and model building.

Finally, the general attitude encountered by Teacher Corps during implementation is clearly represented by the following scene:

Anecdote 9: Another Federal Program!

The scene is the teachers lounge, and the characters are two teachers. The conversation flows as follows:

Teacher 1: "Why do federal project people ask us what kind of inservice we need and then tell us they must offer activities in certain areas, like multicultural education and diagnostic/prescriptive education? THOSE are NOT the topics that I am concerned about at the moment."

Teacher 2: "You know, federal money always has strings attached. Congressmen think they know more about our educational needs than

those of us who live and work right here in this district. What makes me really mad though is having to spend all that money on four interns. There's no way those four graduate students could bring in what they cost us, and although I know there must be a reason behind requiring that the project work with them, I can think of better ways to spend that money to help our poor kids."

Teacher 1: "What bothers me most is the time and money that goes into trying to develop tests to measure changes in foggy things like "improvement of school climate." Those standardized questionnaires don't usually get to the really important things going on in the schools. Why can't evaluators and program people just ask us: 'What do you think of your school climate and why do you think that and what has the federal program done or what can it do to improve school climate? Evaluators just standing around this school watching us and talking to us could pick up some good ideas about how to help us here.

Teacher 2: "We would all agree that neat things have been done here by the federal projects, but I think we also agree that means often get in the way of ends, and staffs have to work extra hard to see those ends accomplished."

These nine anecdotes provide a very tentative glimpse of the real world of the project. Clearly, implementation activity is frequently adorned with notorious obstacles. The marketplace of inservice education is frequented by large number of professionals who carry deep scars from programs in the past which often demeaned them as persons and as professionals. They are skeptical of another program. They question our motives. They demand more explicit descriptions of benefits to be derived.

One other factor which is often not addressed in the development of Federal policy is the time required to implement specific tasks. In order to describe the distribution of time over tasks, five of the six projects of the Experimental Cluster provided a PERT chart of its activities related to inservice development, delivery and evaluation. These charts were analyzed to determine the relationship of time to task. To promote uniformness in data references, the participants agreed to isolate project inservice activity in the following twelve events:

1. Pre-proposal Activity

2. Proposal Writing
3. Proposal Approval
4. Proposal Governance, Reaffirmed, Modified and/or approved
5. Needs Assessment Reaffirmed and Executed
6. Inservice Developed and Approved by Governance System
7. Continuation Proposal Developed and Approved
8. Inservice Modified by Project Expenditure
9. Inservice Delivered
10. Inservice Evaluated
11. Inservice Validated
12. Inservice Dissemination and Demonstration

Time expended on these vital events by five of the Experimental Cluster participants is reported in Table 4 on the following page.

The unique features of each of the five projects are evident in Table 3. Even those highly regulated activities related to proposal preparation such as the first three events required substantially different amounts of time in some of the units. More consistency is evident across projects with the Needs Assessment than with any other event. Yet, perhaps the most important evidence represented by Table 3 is that even with a relatively small number of projects, each working together on a special project such as the Experimental Cluster, it is difficult to acquire a degree of uniformity in calculating time devoted to specific events. As a result one should be cautious about comparisons across projects of the various time stipulations for implementation practices.

Nevertheless, the data can be useful in projecting a profile of each project and the proportional distribution of time within each unit. For example, in project A, when the time required for the delivery of inservice is compared to governance and to needs assessment, it is reasonable to conclude that the delivery is influenced more by the governance processes than by the needs assessment.

Since Procedure Five was conducted not only to relate practices and policies but also to illustrate the application of a forecasting technique to policies

TABLE 4

TIME DEVOTED TO CRITICAL EVENTS FOR INSERVICE DEVELOPMENT

EVENT	INSTITUTIONS				
	A	B	C	D	E
	Prog '78	Prog '78	Prog '78	Prog '79	Prog '78
	Weeks	Weeks	Weeks	Weeks	Weeks
1. Pre-Proposal Activity	15.5	4	4	20	12
2. Proposal Written	4.5	5	4	20	4
3. Proposal Approved	4.5	12	18	12	18
4. Governance Reaffirmed and Formed	22	33	28	6	8
5. Needs Assessment Reaffirmed and Executed	9	6	12	6	8
6. Inservice Developed for Approval by Governance System	8	65	12	6	4
7. Continuation Proposal Developed and Approved	2.4	13	12	6	6
8. Inservice Modified by Project Experience	27	N/A	40	36	8
9. Inservice Delivered	44	*	24	7.2	41
10. Inservice Evaluated	C	8	C	9	C
11. Inservice Validated	0	0	.015	N/A	0
12. Inservice Dissemination and Demonstration	0	0	0	1	0

N/A = Not Applicable
C = Continuous Process

* Not Retrievable

prior to implementation (front-end analysis), both the anecdotes and the analysis of time and task provide a tentative description of project practices related to inservice education. However, this mosaic representation also was used to clarify the possible contribution of a forecasting method for program policies. The model used was adapted from the work of Kiresuk, Lund, Schultz and Larsen (1977) and is identified by the acronym A VICTORY.

In brief, the A VICTORY analysis includes an appraisal of eight variables which function in the processes of organizational change. These variables include the following dimensions:

Ability

- Category 1: Willingness and ability to commit resources to inservice program.
- Category 2: Present availability and skill level of manpower to plan and implement inservice program. Knowledge of inservice program methods by those concerned.

Values

- Category 3: Attitudes and beliefs of those involved toward accepting inservice program.
- Category 4: Organization's history of change, and history of support for change.
- Category 5: Characteristics of staff or administrators thought to bear on acceptance of inservice program (other than attitudes or skill level).
- Category 6: Work relations; supervisory relations; interpersonal relations.
- Category 7: Employment or personnel policies of the organization (i.e., of the employer).

Information

- Category 8: Availability of information bearing on inservice program's present functioning. Availability and use of procedures and channels for recording and communicating inservice program information.

Circumstances

- Category 9: Aspects of the inservice program relating to procedures,

job duties, job requirements, and job expectations.

Category 10: Quality of the relationship between the inservice program and those it serves and those it works with.

Timing

Category 11: Timing of inservice program to coincide or coordinate with other program or organizational activities.

Obligation

Category 12: Felt need to "do something," to take action. Pressure to have inservice. Awareness of present danger to inservice program.

Resistance

Category 13: Expected or feared negative consequences of inservice program. Frontstage or backstage fears of loss resulting from adoption of inservice program.

Yield

Category 14: Expected or hoped for positive consequences of inservice program. Payoff or rewards thought to result from adopting inservice program.

Each category of this framework can be used to develop question(s) which can be responded to by key implementors of policy. For example, the Resistance variable could be surveyed using the following questions:

1. To what extent have you considered what might have to be abandoned as the inservice program is implemented according to the program Rules and Regulations?
2. To what extent have you identified who may lose as the inservice program is implemented?
3. To what extent have you reviewed the reasons others may not endorse the conditions established by Teacher Corps for inservice education?

Information derived from questions of this type would allow the implementor to anticipate the resistance which may be encountered as the inservice program is installed. In applying the A VICTORY model to the anecdotes specific variables can be recognized as critical areas in the implementation of Federal policies

function to promote organizational change. Table 4 includes the identification of anecdotes and the related variables included in this front-end analysis.

TABLE 5

FRONT-END ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL POLICIES ON INSERVICE EDUCATION:
SELECTED CONDITIONS ENCOUNTERED IN TEACHER CORPS

Anecdote	Reference to Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations	A VICTORY Analysis
1. When can we do the assessment?	172.13	<u>Timing</u> Questions: 1. Is this a suitable time to implement the inservice program? 2. Will other events in the school bear on your participation in the inservice program?
2. Documentation in a time capsule	172.60	<u>Circumstances</u> Questions: 1. To what extent does your role responsibilities include school climate development? 2. Does the present situation in the schools seem conducive to successful implementation of an inservice program to improve school climate? <u>Information</u> Questions: 1. Is the information on inservice through Teacher Corps clear to you? 2. Does the information on inservice to improve school climate seem appropriate for the task?

TABLE 5 (cont'd)

FRONT-END ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL POLICIES ON INSERVICE EDUCATION:
SELECTED CONDITIONS ENCOUNTERED IN TEACHER CORPS

Anecdote	Reference to Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations	A VICTORY Analysis
3. What is a Systemic Model?	172.63	<u>Values</u> Questions: 1. To what extent are the values associated with systematic programming consistent with the values of the project leadership? 2. Are the anticipated changes which are associated with systematic improvement in agreement with the values of key participants?
4. Is the sky falling or is it an acorn?	None	<u>Ability</u> Question: 1. Are the skills and knowledge of key personnel appropriate for the expectations of the inservice program?
5. Abruptly terminated or thrown out?	172.45	<u>Obligations</u> Question: 1. Have the demands for implementation of inservice programs been compared with other demands faced by key participants?
6. The inevitable earthquake or is that what you heard?	172.50	<u>Resistance</u> Question: 1. Have you reviewed reasons why others may not adopt the inservice program planned by Teacher Corps?

TABLE 5 (cont'd)

FRONT-END ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL POLICIES ON INSERVICE EDUCATION:
SELECTED CONDITIONS ENCOUNTERED IN TEACHER CORPS

Anecdote	Reference to Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations	A VICTORY Analysis
7. Students of low-income families?	172.2	<u>Yield</u> Questions: 1. Have you considered the benefits of the inservice program for the students of low-income families? 2. Have you considered the indirect rewards available to participants of the inservice program?
8. The service vs. demonstration dilemma.	172.65	<u>Obligations</u> Questions: 1. Has the need for a demonstrable inservice element been determined through sound evaluation? 2. Have the demands for a training demonstration been compared with other demands faced by key participants?
9. Another Federal program!	172.13	<u>Values</u> Questions: 1. To what extent will the proposed inservice address the values held by the target audiences? 2. Are the proposed outcomes of the inservice program consistent with the values held by the target audiences?

In summary, the A VICTORY model can be adapted to assist in the development of a useful forecast of the impact of policy on practice. Each of the eight variables and 14 categories have been defined to the extent that an instrument could be constructed to assess the anticipated reactions to proposed policies. The following survey is an illustration of this point.

FRONT-END ANALYSIS
A FORECAST OF THE IMPACT OF TEACHER CORPS RULES AND
REGULATIONS ON THE LOCAL PROJECT INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Directions: Key participants of Teacher Corps inservice education programs are requested to estimate the impact of Federal policies on implementation efforts. The rating scale below has been designed to be used with each question of this survey. Values associated with the scale are as follows:

- 0 = cannot estimate the impact at this time
- 1 = highly negative impact estimated at this time
- 5 = moderate impact estimated at this time
- 10 = highly positive impact estimated at this time

Even though all values have not been defined for the scale, respondents are encouraged to use all points on the range of ratings from "0" through "10" to report your forecast. Circle the numeral which reflects your assessment.

<u>Organizational Change Variable</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Scale</u>
<u>Ability</u>	1. The IHE component will commit resources to an inservice program.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	2. The LEA component will commit resources to an inservice program.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	3. The IHE component has available personnel to conduct field-based inservice programs in the Teacher Corps community.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	4. The LEA component has available personnel to conduct field-based inservice programs in the Teacher Corps community.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	5. The IHE component has available personnel to conduct graduate level inservice programs.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

FRONT-END ANALYSIS (cont'd)
A FORECAST OF THE IMPACT OF TEACHER CORPS RULES AND
REGULATIONS ON THE LOCAL PROJECT INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM

<u>Organizational Change Variable</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Scale</u>
<u>Values</u>	6. All educational personnel in a cluster school will accept the requirement to plan and carry out inservice.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	7. All educational personnel in cluster schools will value the inservice conducted by the IHE.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	8. All educational personnel in cluster schools will value the inservice conducted by the LEA.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	9. Administrative personnel from cluster schools will openly promote staff participation in inservice.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	10. The inservice program will improve the professional relationships between teachers and administrators in the cluster schools.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	11. The LEA personnel policies will benefit those who participate in inservice education.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<u>Information</u>	12. The documentation of inservice education will provide important evidence on the effectiveness of the inservice program.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<u>Circumstances</u>	13. The personnel development system of the LEA and the inservice program will be coordinated to improve role performance.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	14. The inservice program in the cluster schools will promote improved relationships between and among teachers, teacher educators and students.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<u>Timing</u>	15. The inservice program will benefit the development of other programs in the cluster schools.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

FRONT-END ANALYSIS (cont'd)
A FORECAST OF THE IMPACT OF TEACHER CORPS RULES AND
REGULATIONS ON THE LOCAL PROJECT INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM

<u>Organizational Change Variable</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Scale</u>
<u>Timing (cont'd)</u>	16. Other developments besides personnel development in the LEA will bear upon the response of educational personnel to the inservice program.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<u>Obligation</u>	17. The demands of an inservice program which includes all project outcomes will be acceptable to all educational personnel in cluster schools.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<u>Resistance</u>	18. The LEA system will support released time for educational personnel to participate in inservice programs.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	19. As the inservice program promotes personnel improvement with selected competencies, the program will also address these professional practices which will become obsolete.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
	20. Inservice programs will include an examination of the factors which contribute to cluster school objections to demonstration and dissemination processes.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<u>Yield</u>	21. Inservice programs will clarify the incentives and rewards which are available to participants.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Procedure Six: Synthesis of Findings Regarding the Features of Federal Rules and Regulations, the Assumptive Framework and Operational Practices for Inservice Education

The consolidation of the components included in this analysis was constructed with the assumptive framework as a foundation. Accordingly, this synthesis contains

a collection of findings for each dimension of the framework.

1. The Content Dimension

- a. The consensus of opinions expressed in the technical literature on inservice education is that program content should be determined by a needs assessment, that instruction on the content should occur in the field and that participants should be provided opportunities to be actively involved in the process.
- b. The focus of the Congress in the statute which contains the Teacher Corps Program was to improve inservice programs. Content was not stipulated for these programs.
- c. Teacher Corps Program Rules and Regulations contain 11 mandates and nine discretionary areas for inservice programs. The only requirement which pertains to content is that inservice must focus on all project outcomes.
- d. Teacher Corps Program Rules and Regulations endorse a declining marginal returns theory for the distribution of resources with the stipulation that all outcomes are to be included in the content of inservice programs. This position appears to be inconsistent with the demonstration mandate.
- e. Illustrations of the practices used to implement the Federal policies indicate that even though the content of inservice is ostensibly determined by needs assessment processes, the processes associated with project governance may be contributing to the program content.

2. The Process Dimension

- a. The consensus of opinions expressed in the technical literature emphasized systemic models of program development and collaborative decision making.
- b. Congressional intent regarding processes appears to focus on recruitment and teaming in training and on supporting demonstration activities for inservice education.
- c. Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations emphasize collaborative processes more so than the use of systemic models of development. Process stipulations are more explicit than in content and context dimensions.
- d. Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations include critical inconsistencies regarding the mandate for demonstration processes by stipulating that inservice must include all educational personnel and all project outcomes.

- e. Local project experiences reflect a dual focus on the delivery of inservice programs and on governance processes, most of which are dominated by issues associated with collaboration. Consequently, it appears as if governance and inservice programs are competing for the resources of the project.

3. The Context Dimension

- a. The technical literature contains substantial agreement regarding the need for inservice programs to recognize the organizational context within which they are located including both the support and incentive/reward systems.
- b. Congress appears to highlight the context of "areas having concentrations of low-income families."
- c. Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations appear to be more discretionary than mandatory regarding the context dimension. Program guidelines are explicit concerning the support systems within each cluster school.
- d. A review of the implications of selected program policies for inservice education indicates substantial inconsistencies regarding the influence of context on training agendas and processes. These inconsistencies may limit the effectiveness of the demonstrations of inservice programs.
- e. Contextual or organizational factors clearly promote wide variations in project implementation practices. These local conditions have the impact of linking program policies into complex networks of issues and of emphasizing the knowledge exchange phenomena which complicates the implementation of Federal policy.

CHAPTER FOUR
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING POLICY FOR INSERVICE
PROGRAMS IN TEACHER CORPS

In preparing this monograph, the members of the Experimental Cluster intended to inform Teacher Corps Program policymakers of the impact of Federal policy on local projects. It was assumed that feedback of the type included herein would not only inform key participants in national program roles but also enable local projects to become cognizant of the continuing problems associated with the translation of policy into practice.

The analysis described in this document utilized several techniques including content analysis, the application of a conceptual construct to policy statements and the construction of illustrative materials to represent the realities of implementation. In all, these methods were used to explore selected features of the policy structure for inservice programs in Teacher Corps. This report does not represent an exhaustive study of the phenomena. Rather, the function of the report is to stimulate discussion about a major component of a Federal program which is in the process of implementation. It is a kind of flashback--imperfect, perhaps even improper but most important, it is somewhat immediate. Adjustments can be made in programs to fulfill the high expectations for inservice education in Teacher Corps. Consequently, the recommendations of this Experimental Cluster can be viewed as a kind of treatment for the experimental group--Federal program policymakers.

Recommendations

1. The key features included in the Congressional intent for Teacher Corps should be more evident in the Program Rules and Regulations.
The analysis reported herein led to the conclusions that the Congress

not only expects institutions to improve inservice programs, but also to attract and train teachers for areas having low-income families. The Rules and Regulations tend to emphasize all educational personnel more so than teachers and such regulations do not appear to address in depth the essence of inservice education for areas wherein concentrations of low-income families reside. Furthermore, the statute which establishes Teacher Corps is explicit regarding demonstration projects for retraining. Such specificity does not appear in the program Rules and Regulations.

2. The structure of Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations should be modified to incorporate a clearer delineation of program elements. It is assumed that the manner by which knowledge or information is organized has an influence on the interpretation of the content. Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations contain six subparts--the second of which defines the elements of a Teacher Corps Project. Included as elements is one section on participants and another on Teacher Corps Members. This type of overlap tends to confuse the message and complicate the processes of policy identification.
3. Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations should reflect the differentiated needs of educational personnel to the extent that selected mandated conditions for inservice education programs are eliminated. Through this analysis, an attempt was made to describe the impact of requiring all to participate in a training program and furthermore, to require all training to take place in a certain type of locale (field-based) and to require all training to be designed to reflect graduate study. This type of confusion reflects a lack of conceptual clarity in the formulation of program designs.
4. The requirement for demonstration projects with inservice education should be more clearly articulated in the program Rules and Regulations and such guidelines should consistently reflect the need to focus resources in such demonstration efforts. In too many instances, Teacher Corps regulations present projects with a double bind and the subsequent appraisal that a local project cannot successfully implement all policy. Beliefs of this type tend to promote the attitude that since a project cannot successfully meet all policy stipulations, then one need not take Federal policy too seriously. It is an erosion of confidence--a wearing away of policy and an attending belief that only local customs must prevail. Consequently, local projects devote large amounts of time negotiating compromises which usually have little chance of serving as a training demonstration but possess powerful potential as an illustration of the impotence of Federal policy.
5. Processes by which program policies are established should be modified to include the development of policy through a series of interactions with project implementers. As policy is now established, Federal program specialists prepare tentative rules and regulations and obtain feedback from the field. This recommendation does not pertain to that process but rather is associated to the building of policy from a knowledge exchange strategy. Included in this exchange should be procedures by which the impact of policy is estimated through systems of front-end analysis. Such a system is described in Chapter Three in the A VICTORY model.

6. New policy in Teacher Corps should reflect the result of studies involving the analysis of policy impact on existing project practices. In this work, an assumptive framework was designed to include content, process and context dimensions. The relationships between these dimensions appear to represent the significant issues encountered at the project level. For example, to what extent does collaborative decision making processes produce inservice agendas which deal directly with the needs of low-income families? This is a process-content phenomena. In-depth studies would appear to be useful in improving institutional practices toward inservice education.

While other specific recommendations could be extracted from the information included in this document, perhaps this restricted list will serve to initiate the needed debate on inservice education in Teacher Corps. Perhaps the most convincing evidence one could gather regarding the effectiveness of inservice programs would be from the students. Perhaps we should ask the following question of the students whose teachers are engaged with the inservice education program:

What improvements have you noticed in your school experience since your instructor began to participate in the professional development program?

The question implies, of course, that if when all the discussion regarding the development of an effective inservice education master plan is completed, there is no improvement in the school experience, the inservice participation then has been an exercise in futility. Consequently, it is the author's sincere hope that the material herein will dispell this possibility and challenge future thinking in the area of inservice education.

Despite regulatory ambiguities and interpretable commentaries, there is a unanimity of purpose that pervades the six projects to which this manuscript refers. Although the projects that participated in this paper reflect different regions and demonstrate distinct approaches to inservice education, although they are influenced by different program monitors who provide an additional layer of interpretation of Federal policy, they do reflect the major outcomes, components, and collaborative governance processes intended by the Teacher Corps mandates.

This commonality across projects suggests that inservice teacher education

may be influenced by Teacher Corps and the seasoned professional staffs this project supports throughout the country. While Teacher Corps does represent a "critical mass" with Federal regulations and Federal monitoring practices which stimulate unique demonstration programs, processes, and practices within each project site, the impact the program will have on inservice teacher education, beginning with the broadest possible knowledge base, which portend even greater and more rapid change in educational practice that can make a difference in the lives of low income and minority group children.

REFERENCES

- Allen, D. In-service teacher training: a modest proposal. In L. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Banathy, B.H. Instructional systems. Belmont, Calif.: Fearon, 1968.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting educational change: The findings in review (Vol. 4) (R-1589/4-HEW). Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand, 1975.
- Bloom, B. J., Hastings, J. T., & Madaus, G. P. Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Brandt, R. M. The child study movement. In B. R. Joyce and L. P. Peck (Coordinators), Teacher education concepts project: Cultural pluralism and social change (Report No. 5). Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, National Dissemination Center, 1977.
- Bush, R. N. Curriculum-proof teachers: Who does what to whom? In L. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Cory, N. D. Incentives used in motivating professional growth of teachers. Chicago, Illinois: North Central Assn. of Colleges and Secondary Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 027 254)
- Doll, R. C. Curriculum improvement: Decision making and process (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.
- Dougharty, A. A Policy Analysis of the Critical Mass Concept in the Allocation of Compensatory Education Funds. Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 1979, 1 (3), 5-17.
- Drummond, W. Collaboration in inservice education. In T. E. Andrews (Ed.), Issues in inservice education: State action for inservice. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1976.
- Edelfelt, R. A. Criteria for local inservice programs. In R. Edelfelt (Ed.), Inservice education. Bellingham, Wash.: Western Washington State College, 1977 a.
- Edelfelt, R. A. Staff development: What's to be done in the future? In C. W. Beegle & R. Edelfelt (Eds.), Staff development: Staff liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977 b.
- Fischer, L. In-service education: An immodest proposal. In L. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

- Fischler, A. S. Confrontation: Changing teacher behavior through clinical supervision. In L. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Freiberg, H. J. Demonstrating the concept of alternative schools (HEW contracts G0076-3584 and 489-AH70118). Houston, Texas: University of Houston, 1977.
- Gant, J. L., Hansen, J. H., South, O. Temporary systems. Unpublished manuscript, 1977. (Available from P.O. Box 20011, Tallahassee, Fla.).
- George, U. E., & Stern, B. A model for providing released time for teachers to participate in inservice training. In J. M. Cooper (Ed.), Problems, and processes of inservice education. Atlanta, Georgia: Atlanta University, Southeastern Teacher Corps Network, 1977.
- Gilchrist, B. S., & Gott, J. W. Strengthening curriculum decisions through a curriculum approach. Thrust, 1971, 1, 28.
- Goldhammer, R. Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Hall, G. E. What context? Is it in use? Austin, Texas: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1977.
- Howey, K. R. Minneapolis Public Schools/University of Minnesota Teacher Center: In-service training for open classroom teachers. In B. R. Joyce & L. F. Peck (Coordinators), The inservice teacher education concepts project: Creative authority and collaboration (Report No. 4). Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, National Dissemination Center, 1977.
- Jackson, P. Teaching old dogs new tricks. In L. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- James, Lord of Rusholme. Teacher education and training: A report by a committee of inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science under the chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.
- Jeffers, S. H. & McDaniels, D. Building a preservice-inservice continuum: The Washington experience. In R. Edelfelt & M. Johnson (Eds.), Rethinking in-service education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.
- Joyce, B. R. Structural imagination and professional staff development. In T. E. Andrews (Ed.), Issues in inservice education: State action for inservice. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1976.
- Joyce, B. R., Howey, K. R., & Yarger, S. J. In B. R. Joyce & L. P. Peck (Coordinators), The inservice teacher education concepts project: Issues to face (Report 1). Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, National Dissemination Center, 1977.

- Joyce, B. R., McNair, K. M., Diaz, R., & McKibbins, M. O. In B. R. Joyce and L. P. Peck (Coordinators), The inservice teacher education concepts project. Perceptions of professionals and policy makers (Report No. 3). Syracuse University: National Dissemination Center, 1977.
- Joyce, B. R. & Showers, B. Training ourselves: What we have learned about our ability to learn. New York: Fordham University Press, 1977.
- Kiresuk, J., Lund, Sander H., Schultz, Susank., & Larsen, E. Translating theory into practice: Change research at the program evaluation resource center. Evaluation, 1977, 4, 89-95
- Lawrence, G. Patterns of effective inservice education: A state of the art summary of research on materials and procedures for changing teacher behaviors in inservice education. Report prepared by the state of Florida, Department of Education, December, 1974.
- Lippitt, R. The dynamics of planned change. New York: Harcourt, 1968.
- Lippitt, R., & Fox, R. Development and maintenance of effective classroom learning. In L. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Long, D. H. Competency-based staff development. In C. W. Beegle & R. Edelfelt (Eds.), Staff development: Staff liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Lortie, D. C. School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Macdonald, J. B. Scene and context: American society today. In C. W. Beegle & R. Edelfelt (Eds.), Staff development: Staff liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Manning, B. A. The trouble shooting checklist for school-based settings. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1976.
- Mesa, R. P. Implications for inservice education of the urban/rural school development program experience. In B. R. Joyce & L. P. Peck (Coordinators), The inservice teacher education concepts project: Cultural pluralism and social change (Report No. 5). Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, National Dissemination Center, 1977.
- Nelson, B. On-site, in-service teacher training via helping teachers. In C. W. Beegle & R. Edelfelt (Eds.), Staff development: Staff liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Nicholson, M. and Joyce, B. R. The literature on inservice teacher education: An analytic review. Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Centers, 1977.
- Nystrand, R. O. & Cunningham, L. L. Organizing schools to develop human capabilities. In To nurture humaneness: Yearbook of the Association for Supervision

- and Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1970.
- Plowden, B. Children and their primary schools: A report of the Central Advisory for Education (England) (Vol. 1). London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.
- Popham, J. W. Educational evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Prentice, M. Management: Curse, cure-all, or workable concept? Educational Leadership, Jan. 1973, 30, 310.
- Rosner, B., Cohen, Devalut, Schalock, Stewart, Turner, & Little. The power of competency-based teacher education: A report. Washington, D.C., National Center for Educational Research and Development, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 069618).
- Rubin, L. (Ed.). Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Scriven, M. Evaluation bias and its control (Paper No. 4) Michigan: Western Michigan University, Evaluation Center, 1972.
- Scriven, M. Evaluation perspectives and procedures. In W. J. Popham (Ed.), Evaluation in education-current applications. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974.
- Shingleton, C. P. Accountability in staff development. In C. W. Beegie & R. Edelfelt (Eds.), Staff development: Staff liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Smith, E. B. Improvement of in-service education: A collaborative effort. In R. Edelfelt & M. Johnson (Eds.), Rethinking inservice education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.
- Teacher Corps Project: Development and operation, Federal Register, February 23, 1978, pp. 7524-7539.
- Thelen, H. A. A cultural approach to in-service teacher training. In L. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Tikunoff, W., & Ward, B. Context: Some important considerations for research on teaching (Report No. A77-4). San Francisco, Calif.: Far West Laboratory, 1977.
- Townsend, Karan A case study of a clinical inservice teacher education model. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1979.
- Tyler, R. W. Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.

- Tyler, R. W. In-service education of teachers: A look at the past and future. In L. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Unruh, G. G. Responsive curriculum development: Theory and action. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1975.
- Van Ryn, M., & Santelli, C. Financing inservice education: A dialogue. In T. E. Andrews (Ed.), Issues in inservice education: State action for inservice. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, National Council of States on In-Service Education, 1976.
- West, S. C. How research helps staff development: In schools and in big business. In C. W. Beegle & R. Edelfelt (Eds.), Staff development: Staff liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Westby-Gibson, D. Inservice education: perspectives for education. San Francisco, Calif.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 015 161).